00037641

Digitized with financial assistance from

HT Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 15 October, 2018

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN EUROPE

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF CURRENT HISTORY

BY

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

AND

CHARLES A. BEARD

ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF POLITICS IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

37641

VOLUME I

GINN & COMPANY

BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · LONDON

910.2
Rob/Dev
37641

Entered at Stationers' Hall

Copyright, 1907, by
James Harvey Robinson and Charles A. Beard

All rights reserved

614.7

The Athenæum Press
GINN & COMPANY · PROPRIETORS · BOSTON · U.S.A.

PREFACE

It has been a common defect of our historical manuals that, however satisfactorily they have dealt with more or less remote periods, they have ordinarily failed to connect the past with the present. And teachers still pay a mysterious respect to the memory of Datis and Artaphernes which they deny to gentlemen in frock coats, like Gladstone and Gambetta. The gloomy incidents of the capture of Numantia are scrupulously impressed upon the minds of children who have little chance of ever hearing of the siege of Metz. The organization of the Achæan League is given preference to that of the present German Empire.

There are some teachers, perhaps, who would seek to justify the current disregard of recent history, but many others would agree with one of the guild who, when criticised for giving more attention in her instruction to Charlemagne than to Bismarck, complained with truth, "But we know so much more about Charlemagne than about Bismarck." The great majority of those interested in history would no doubt gladly readjust their perspective if they had the means of doing so; and, indeed, there has been a marked improvement in this respect in the newer books which are giving more and more space to recent events.

In preparing the volume in hand, the writers have consistently subordinated the past to the present. It has been their ever-conscious aim to enable the reader to catch up with his own times; to read intelligently the foreign news in the morning paper; to know what was the attitude of Leo XIII toward the social democrats even if he has forgotten that of Innocent III toward the Albigenses.

Yet, in permitting the present to dominate the past, they do not feel that they have dealt less fairly with the general outline of European history during the last two centuries than they would have done had they merely narrated the events with no ulterior object. There has been no distortion of the facts in order to bring them into relation to any particular conception of the present or its tendencies. Even if certain occurrences of merely temporary prominence have been omitted as irrelevant to the purpose of the work, this cannot mean any serious loss.

The way in which the narrative emerges into the living present is, then, one of the claims of this new manual to be regarded as an adventurer in the educational world. A second trait of novelty is the happy reunion of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which should never have been put asunder by the date 1789. The nineteenth century was often too arrogant to recognize its dependence upon the eighteenth, from which it derived most of its inspirations as well as its aversions. It was the eighteenth century which set the problems of progress and suggested their solutions, leaving to its successor the comparatively simple task of working them out in detail and making fuller application of them.

Lastly, the writers have ventured to devote much less space to purely political and military events than has commonly been assigned to them in histories of the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the more fundamental economic matters have been generously treated, — the Industrial Revolution, commerce and the colonies, the internal reforms of the European states, even the general advance of science, have all, so far as possible, been given their just due.

The necessarily succinct outline of events which fills these volumes can be considerably amplified and enlivened by the accompanying *Readings in Modern European History* which follows the narrative chapter by chapter and furnishes examples of the stuff of which history is made.

As for their sources, the writers, who have had at their disposal a very extensive library, would find it difficult to enumerate the debts which they owe to a wide range of historical writers and to collections of materials, large and small. The bibliographies given in the *Readings* will indicate fairly the extent of their investigations. In some of the chapters, especially those relating to the French Revolution and Napoleon, the writers have borrowed here and there from Robinson's *History of Western Europe*. They wish to express their obligations to their colleague, Professor James T. Shotwell, for many suggestions, and their appreciation of the kindness of Professor Myers and Professor Cheyney in permitting them to reproduce several of their maps. While the greatest pains has been taken to establish the strict accuracy of every assertion and the authenticity of every alleged fact, the writers cannot flatter themselves that they have escaped all the pitfalls that must perforce beset the path of those who boldly undertake to guide others through the most intricate developments in the whole recorded history of our planet.

J. H. R.
C. A. B.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY 1

CHAPTER

I. FRANCE UNDER LOUIS XIV

1. France before Louis XIV 4
2. Louis XIV (1643–1715) 6
3. Reforms of Colbert (1661–1683) 10

II. EUROPE AND LOUIS XIV

4. Louis XIV's Attempt to annex the Spanish Netherlands (1667–1668) 14
5. Louis XIV's War against the Dutch (1672–1678) . 18
6. Louis XIV's Plan of encroaching by "Reunions" upon the Holy Roman Empire 22
7. The English Revolution of 1688 and the War of the League of Augsburg (1688–1697) 28

III. RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE AT UTRECHT

8. The Question of the Spanish Succession 34
9. Will of Charles II, and War of the Spanish Succession 39
10. Peace of Utrecht, 1713 42

IV. RUSSIA AND PRUSSIA BECOME EUROPEAN POWERS

11. Peter the Great plans to make Russia a European Power 50
12. Rise of Prussia 55

V. THE WARS OF FREDERICK THE GREAT

13. Frederick the Great and Maria Theresa 60
14. The Seven Years' War (1756–1763) 68
15. Three Partitions of Poland, 1772, 1793, and 1795 . 71

VI. THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND FOR INDIA

16. How Europe began to extend its Commerce over the Whole World 80
17. England gains a Foothold in India 87
18. India and the Struggle between England and France for its Possession 91

CHAPTER PAGE

VII. THE RIVALRY OF FRANCE AND ENGLAND IN NORTH AMERICA

19. How the European Nations established themselves in the New World 101
20. Struggle between France and England for North America 111
21. Revolt of the American Colonies from England . . 117

VIII. THE OLD RÉGIME IN EUROPE

22. Condition of the Country People: Serfdom . . 122
23. The Towns and the Guilds 127
24. The Nobility 131
25. The Catholic Church 135
26. The Jesuits and Ultramontanism 143
27. The English Established Church and the Protestant Sects 150

IX. THE SPIRIT OF REFORM

28. The Development of Modern Science . . . 157
29. How the Scientific Discoveries produced a Spirit of Reform 167

X. THE ENLIGHTENED DESPOTS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

30. Reforms of Frederick II, Catharine II, Joseph II, and Charles III 184
31. Peculiarities of the English Government in the Eighteenth Century 195

XI. THE EVE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

32. The *Ancien Régime* in France 203
33. How Louis XVI tried to play the Benevolent Despot 217

XII. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

34. How the Estates General were summoned in 1789 . 224
35. First Reforms of the National Assembly, July–October, 1789 233
36. The National Assembly at Paris, October, 1789, to September, 1791 240

XIII. THE FIRST FRENCH REPUBLIC

37. The Abolition of the Monarchy, 1791–1792 . . . 249
38. The Reign of Terror 264

CHAPTER PAGE

XIV. NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

39. Bonaparte's First Italian Campaign 284
40. How Bonaparte made himself Master of France . 293
41. The Second Coalition against France 298

XV. EUROPE AND NAPOLEON

42. Bonaparte restores Order and Prosperity in France . 309
43. Napoleon destroys the Holy Roman Empire and reorganizes Germany 315
44. The Continental Blockade 323
45. Napoleon at the Zenith of his Power (1808–1812) . 326
46. The Fall of Napoleon 333

XVI. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE AT THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

47. The Congress of Vienna and its Work . . . 343
48. The Holy Alliance: Metternich becomes the Chief Opponent of Revolution 357

LIST OF MAPS

		Page
1	Europe when Louis XIV began his Personal Government	14–15
2	The Netherlands in 1661	18–19
3	The Holy Roman Empire in the Age of Louis XIV	22–23
4	Europe after the Treaties of Utrecht and Rastadt	42–43
5	The Italian States in 1750	46–47
6	Northeastern Europe in the Time of Peter the Great	52–53
7	Sketch Map of the Territories of the Great Elector of Prussia	57
8	Prussia under Frederick the Great	64–65
9	The Partition of Poland	76–77
10	Sketch Map of the Voyages of Discovery	83
11	Sketch Map of the Malay Archipelago	85
12	India about 1763	92–93
13	Explorations and Colonies of the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries	106–107
14	England, France, and Spain in North America in 1750	110–111
15	Sketch Map of the Atlantic Coast	115
16	Sketch Map of the Provinces of France showing the Interior Customs Lines	206
17	Sketch Map illustrating the Salt Tax	207
18	France during the Revolution	250–251
19	Sketch Map of Central Europe to illustrate Napoleon's Campaigns, 1796–1801	290
20	Sketch Map to illustrate Bonaparte's Egyptian Campaign	295
21	Europe at the Time of Napoleon's Greatest Power, about 1810	332–333
22	Europe in 1815	352–353

FULL-PAGE ILLUSTRATIONS

		Page
I	Louis XIV's Bedroom at Versailles	10
II	Sir Isaac Newton	164
III	Voltaire	170
IV	Joseph II	188
V	Danton	252
VI	Napoleon	328

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN EUROPE

VOLUME I

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE NAPOLEONIC PERIOD

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN EUROPE

INTRODUCTORY

History essential to an understanding of the present

History deals with the past and is ordinarily studied with no other aim than that of learning about bygone events and famous men long since dead. Yet it requires no large amount of observation to perceive that history casts light upon the customs and institutions which surround us at the present hour. Consequently students of every branch of human knowledge — science, political economy, philosophy, politics, and religion — are turning more seriously than ever before to the past, not for its own sake merely, but with a hope of coming to know the present better through a knowledge of the past.

It is indeed a curious and important discovery of modern times that the existing forms of government and social life are not to be understood by simply examining them, but by taking the trouble to find out how they came to be what they are. Every event in our own lives is determined and explained by preceding events, and this is equally true of the history of nations. Every country — England, Germany, France, Italy, Russia — has its own special past, which serves to explain in a large measure why each differs from all the others. The present situation of each would be incomprehensible except for the key furnished by history. It is history alone that makes clear why Germany is a federation like the United States but nevertheless very different in many respects; why England is a monarchy but far more like a republic than its fellow-kingdom Prussia; why France is a republic while Spain remains a monarchy.

How one's personal conduct is based upon a knowledge of his own individual history

The inexorable dependence of the present upon the past may be clearly illustrated by our own personal experience. The daily thoughts and actions of each of us rest upon his knowledge of his own history. Any man would be in a sorry state if he should forget his own past every night and be compelled to start out afresh every morning, discovering anew his relatives and friends and puzzling out again once familiar streets.

It is, in short, his knowledge of his own past that makes a person's surroundings intelligible to him and renders the doings of the day something more than gropings in an ever strange and unaccountable world. We must perforce build our to-day upon the memory of yesterday. And just as our own private history enables us to interpret what would otherwise have no meaning for us, so the history of nations serves to show why they are what they are and why they do as they do. For institutions are, after all, only the habits of nations and can be understood only by discovering their origin and following their gradual development.

One may look to history to explain almost everything, great and small, from the constitution of a state to the form of a written character or the presence of useless buttons upon a man's coat sleeve.[1] And it is the special purpose of this volume to dwell as fully as is possible within its limits on those events, conditions, and public persons that have made the governments, politics, industries, and intellectual interests of Europe what they are to-day.

Reasons for beginning our study by reviewing the history of the eighteenth century

Obviously no special date can be fixed as the starting point of our story, for in some instances it will be necessary to go farther back than in others in seeking light on the present. For instance, the conditions that produced the war between

[1] Our characters & and + are both derived from *et*, the Latin word for "and," as it was hastily written by mediæval scribes. The abbreviation *viz.* was originally the first two letters of the Latin word for "namely," *videlicet*, followed by a semicolon (then the sign of abbreviation), which came to be written like a *z*. The buttons which still adorn the back of a man's coat were, we presume, used in the time of George Washington to fasten up the tails, while those which still survive on the sleeves were used to button back the cuffs.

Spain and the United States carry us back to the days of Columbus and the old Spanish colonial policy; whereas for the beginnings of the railway system we need not go beyond the generation of George Stephenson. In general, however, Europe of to-day can be quite well understood if the wonderful achievements since the opening of the eighteenth century are properly grasped.

Could Benjamin Franklin, who visited France in 1776, see that country now, how startling would the changes seem to him! The railroads, the steel steamships, the great towns with well-lighted, smoothly paved, and carefully drained streets; the innumerable newspapers and the beautifully illustrated periodicals, the government schools, the popular elections, the deserted palaces of the king, the vast factories full of machinery, working with a precision and rapidity far surpassing those of an army of skilled workmen; most astonishing of all, the mysterious and multiform applications of that lightning which he himself had years before drawn down his kite string, — all these marvels would combine to convince him that he died on the eve of the greatest revolution in industry, government, and science that the world has ever seen.

It seems best, therefore, to begin our account with a review of the territorial changes, national policies, economic conditions, and intellectual interests of western Europe during a few decades before the French Revolution and before that still more vital Industrial Revolution which has served to alter so profoundly the life of the mass of mankind. The nineteenth century, in one sense, only garnered in the rich harvest which the eighteenth century had not only sown but devotedly cultivated. For it was the eighteenth century that gave us the working steam engine (which was destined to metamorphose the world), brought old ideas and customs sternly to the bar of reason, roused men's slumbering discontent with ancient abuses, pointed the way to reform, and opened up that infinite vista of progress which now stretches before us.

CHAPTER I

FRANCE UNDER LOUIS XIV

France before Louis XIV

Leading rôle of France during the last two centuries

1. The nation which has unmistakably assumed the leading rôle in European affairs during the past two hundred years is France. At the opening of the eighteenth century she already enjoyed a commanding position. In the wars to which the ambition of her king, Louis XIV, gave rise, almost all the countries of western Europe took part; even their colonies in distant regions were involved, and the map of the world was fundamentally altered. A generation after Louis XIV's death France began to be recognized as the great teacher of Europe; her philosophers and economists denounced the abuses which existed everywhere and urged the reform of ancient, outworn institutions. When, in due time, France wrought a revolution in her own government, she speedily forced other nations to follow her example. Indeed, carried away by the genius of her general, Napoleon Bonaparte, she seemed at one time about to bring all Europe under her sway. Even since that arch-disturber of the peace was finally captured and sent to die on the rock of St. Helena, France has twice precipitated serious crises in European affairs, when in 1848 she proclaimed a new revolution, and in 1870 she assumed the responsibility for the last important war that has afflicted western Europe.

Feudal background of modern France

Of the long history of France from the conquest of Gaul by Julius Cæsar to the accession of Louis XIV in 1643 little can be said here. The French kings had, from about the year 1100, begun to get the better of their vassals and had succeeded, with some setbacks, in forming a tolerably

satisfactory kingdom when, about a hundred years before Louis XIV's time, the struggle between Protestants and Catholics produced new and terrible disorder which lasted for a whole generation.

Henry IV strengthens the monarchy

After the close of the wars of religion Henry of Navarre (1589–1610), Louis XIV's grandfather, reformed and strengthened the royal power. He had himself been a Protestant in his earlier days and consequently treated the Huguenots with consideration; he assigned them fortified cities of refuge, and granted them certain privileges in order to protect them from attacks by their Catholic enemies. But Henry was assassinated in 1610 and his great work was left half done, although he has always remained an heroic and popular figure.

How Richelieu reduced the power of the Huguenots and of the nobles

Henry's son, Louis XIII, had little capacity and he prudently delegated the direction of the government to Cardinal Richelieu, probably the greatest minister that France has ever had. Richelieu found that the Huguenots, owing to the exceptional position in which Henry had placed them, were "sharing the monarchy with the king," as he expressed it. He accordingly reduced them to the position of ordinary subjects by depriving them, after a struggle, of the cities of refuge granted them by Henry IV.

The strength of the disorderly tendencies of the nobility had much increased during the turmoil of the prolonged wars of religion. Richelieu accordingly ordered the destruction of all the unnecessary castles and fortresses within the realm, on the ground that they served as so many temptations to resist the king's officers. These officers themselves, who too often acted as if they were absolute rulers in their districts, were strictly watched and corrected by the minister, who was ever jealous of his sovereign's rights.

Mazarin and the Fronde

His successor, the wily Italian, Mazarin, who conducted the government during Louis XIV's boyhood, was able to put down the last preposterous rising of the discontented nobles in the so-called War of the Fronde.

Results of the work of Richelieu and Mazarin

When Mazarin died in 1661 he left to the young monarch a kingdom such as no previous French king had enjoyed. The nobles, who for centuries had disputed the power with Hugh Capet and his successors, were no longer feudal lords but only courtiers. The Huguenots, whose claim to a place in the state beside the Catholics had led to the terrible civil wars of the sixteenth century, were reduced in numbers and no longer held fortified towns from which they could defy the king's agents. Richelieu and Mazarin had successfully taken part in the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), and France had come out of it with enlarged territory and increased importance in European affairs.

Louis XIV (1643–1715)

General policy of Louis XIV

2. Louis XIV carried the work of these great ministers still further. He gave that despotic form to the monarchy which it retained until the French Revolution. He made himself the very mirror of kingship. His brilliant court at Versailles became the model and the despair of other less opulent and powerful princes, who accepted his theory of the absolute authority of kings and would gladly have imitated his luxury. By his incessant wars of aggression he kept Europe in turmoil for over half a century. The distinguished generals — Turenne, Condé, and Vauban — who led his newly organized troops, and the unscrupulous diplomats who arranged his alliances and negotiated his treaties, made France feared and respected by even the most formidable of the other European states.

The theory of the divine right of kings

Louis had the same idea of kingship which the first Stuart king of England, James I, had fifty years earlier tried in vain to induce the English people to accept. God had given kings to men, and it was God's will that monarchs should be regarded as his lieutenants and that all those subject to them should obey them absolutely, without asking any questions or making

any criticisms; for in yielding to their princes they were really yielding to God himself. The Bible was used to prove that the person of the king was sacred and that to attack in any way the anointed of the Lord was sacrilege. If the king were good and wise, his subjects should thank the Lord; if he proved foolish, cruel, or perverse, they must accept their evil ruler as a punishment which God had inflicted upon them for their sins. But in no case might they limit his power or rise against him.[1]

Different attitude of the English and French nations toward absolute monarchy

Louis had one distinct advantage over the Stuart kings. The English had generally shown themselves more reluctant than the French to place absolute power in the hands of their rulers. By her Parliament, her courts, and her various declarations of the nation's rights, England had built up traditions which made it impossible for the Stuarts to establish their claim to be absolute rulers.

The Estates General

In France, on the other hand, there was no Great Charter or Petition of Right; nor had a representative body like the English Parliament developed which could restrain the king and his officers by refusing to grant them money. The French kings, it is true, had from about the year 1300 been accustomed to call together from time to time representatives of the three estates of the realm, — namely, the nobility, the clergy, and the so-called "third estate," or townspeople. But the Estates General, as this body was called, assembled only at rare intervals, and while they often protested against heavy taxes and bad government, they did not hold the purse strings. The French king was consequently permitted to raise money without asking the permission of the Estates or previously redressing the grievances which they chose to point out. The king could therefore cheerfully dispense with these assemblies, especially as he did not relish their criticisms and demands for reform.

[1] The distinguished prelate, Bossuet, wrote a treatise on *Politics drawn from the very words of Scripture*. This was to explain to the heir to the French throne his lofty position and responsibilities toward God. See Robinson and Beard, *Readings in Modern European History*, sect. 2, for extracts.

When Louis XIV took personal charge of the government forty-seven years had passed without a meeting of the Estates General, and a century and a quarter was still to elapse before they were again summoned, in 1789.

England did not need so strongly centralized a government as France

The French people placed far more reliance upon a powerful king than the English, because they were not protected by the sea from their neighbors, as England was. On every side France had enemies ready to take advantage of any weakness or hesitation which might arise from dissension between a parliament and the king; so the French had become accustomed to trust matters of government to the monarch's judgment, even if they suffered at times from his tyranny.

Excessive powers of the absolute monarch

In our democratic age the powers which the French king could legally exercise appear shocking. He was permitted to take as much of his people's money as he could get, and to do with it what he would, since he could both impose new and increase old taxes. No distinction was made between his private funds and the state treasury, from which he could help himself freely, spending what his subjects could ill afford to give him in presents to courtiers, reckless extravagance, or needless wars. What was worse, he could, by simply signing an order, imprison any one he wished for any length of time without any legal proceedings. He could call before him any case which was being tried in the courts and decide it as he pleased. But more will be said of the powers of the French kings when we come to see how they lost them in the great Revolution of 1789.

Personal characteristics of Louis XIV

Louis XIV was personally well adapted to assume the rôle of God's representative on earth. He was a handsome man, of elegant and courtly mien and the most exquisite perfection of manner; even when playing billiards he retained an air of world mastery. The first of the Stuarts, on the contrary, had been a very awkward man, whose slouching gait, intolerable manners, and pedantic conversation were utterly at variance with his lofty pretensions. Louis added to his graceful

exterior a sound judgment and quick apprehension. He said neither too much nor too little. He was, for a king, a hard worker and spent several hours a day attending to the business of government.

It requires in fact a great deal of energy and application to be a real despot. In order to understand and to solve the problems which constantly face the ruler of a great state, a monarch must, like Frederick the Great or Napoleon, rise early and toil late. Louis was greatly aided by the able ministers who sat in his council, but he always retained for himself the place of first minister. He would never have consented to be dominated by an adviser, as his father had been by Richelieu. "The profession of the king," he declared, "is great, noble, and delightful if one but feels equal to performing the duties which it involves," and he never harbored a doubt that he himself was born for the business.[1]

The king's palace at Versailles

Louis XIV was careful that his surroundings should suit the grandeur of his office. His court was magnificent beyond anything that had been dreamed of in the Occident. He had an enormous palace constructed at Versailles, just outside of Paris, with interminable halls and apartments and a vast garden stretching away behind it. About this a town was laid out, where all those lived who were privileged to be near his Majesty or supply the wants of the royal court. This palace and its outlying buildings, including two or three less gorgeous residences for the king when he occasionally tired of the ceremony at Versailles, probably cost the nation about a hundred million dollars, in spite of the fact that thousands of peasants and soldiers were forced to aid in the construction of the buildings and parks without remuneration. The furnishings and decorations were as rich and costly as the palace was splendid. For over a century Versailles continued to be the home of the French kings and the seat of their government.

[1] There is no reason to suppose that Louis himself ever used the famous expression, "I am the State," but it exactly expresses his idea of government.

Life at Louis XIV's court

This splendor and luxury helped to attract the nobility, who no longer lived on their estates in well-fortified castles, planning how they might escape the royal control. They now dwelt in the effulgence of the king's countenance; they saw him to bed at night, and in stately procession they greeted him in the morning. It was deemed a high honor to hand him his shirt as he was being dressed, or, at dinner, to provide him with a fresh napkin. Only by living close to the king could the courtiers hope to gain favors, pensions, and lucrative offices for themselves and their friends, and perhaps occasionally to exercise some little influence upon the policy of the government. For they were now entirely dependent upon the good will of their monarch.

Absolutism gradually superseded by constitutional government in the nineteenth century

The exalted position of the French king, his claims to concentrate in his person, by God's will, all the powers of government without the coöperation or participation of his people, is a matter of the utmost significance in appreciating the history of Europe during the past two centuries. Only in the light of these pretensions can the French Revolution be understood. It must also be remembered that the other European sovereigns claimed, in general, similar powers and prerogatives. The various ways in which each was finally forced, or induced, during the nineteenth century to accept a constitution which limited his arbitrary control and gave the people a voice in the government are among the most important subjects which we shall have to study.

Reforms of Colbert (1661–1683)

3. Louis XIV was not indifferent, however, to the welfare of the nation over which he believed God had called him to rule. He permitted his distinguished adviser, the financier Colbert, trained in the service of Mazarin, to remedy such abuses as he could, and even to undertake certain important reforms. Colbert, to whom France still looks back with gratitude, early

discovered that Louis's officials were stealing and wasting vast sums. The offenders were arrested and forced to disgorge, and a new system of bookkeeping was introduced similar to that employed by business men.

Colbert subjects manufactures to government oversight

He then turned his attention to increasing the manufactures of France both by establishing new industries and by seeing that the older ones kept to a high standard, which would make French goods sell readily in foreign markets. He argued justly that if foreigners could be induced to buy French products, these sales would bring gold and silver into the country and so enrich it. He made rigid rules as to the width and quality of cloths which the manufacturers might produce and the dyes which they might use. He even reorganized the old, mediæval guilds and encouraged their monopoly; for through them the government could keep an eye on all the manufacturing that was carried on, and this would have been far more difficult if every one had been free to engage in any trade which he might choose. There were serious drawbacks to this kind of government regulation, but France accepted it, nevertheless, for many years.

Art and literature in the reign of Louis XIV

It was, however, as a patron of art and literature that Louis XIV gained much of his celebrity. Molière, who was at once a playwright and an actor, delighted the court with comedies in which he delicately satirized the foibles of his time. Corneille, who had gained renown by the great tragedy of *The Cid* in Richelieu's day, found a worthy successor in Racine, perhaps the most distinguished of French tragic poets. The charming letters of Madame de Sévigné are models of prose style and serve at the same time to give us a glimpse into the more refined side of the court. In the famous memoirs of Saint-Simon, the weaknesses of the king, as well as the numberless intrigues of the courtiers, are freely exposed with inimitable skill and wit.[1]

[1] For examples of the writings of both Madame de Sévigné and of Saint-Simon, see *Readings*, sect. 3.

Colbert encourages science

Men of letters were generously aided by the king with pensions. Colbert encouraged the French Academy, which had been created by Richelieu. This body gave special attention to making the French tongue more eloquent and expressive by determining what words should be used. It is to this day the greatest honor that a Frenchman can obtain to be made one of the forty members of this celebrated group. Colbert founded in 1666 the French Academy of Sciences which has since done so much to extend knowledge; he had an astronomical observatory built at Paris, and gave his support and protection to a magazine devoted to careful reviews of new books, the *Journal des Savants*, which is still published regularly. The Royal Library, which then possessed only about sixteen thousand volumes, began to grow into that great collection of two and a half million volumes — the largest in existence — which to-day attracts scholars to Paris from all parts of the world. In short, Louis and his ministers believed one of the chief objects of any government to be the promotion of art, literature, and science, and the example they set has been followed by almost every modern state.

Louis XIV's warlike enterprises

Unfortunately for France, the king's ambitions were by no means altogether peaceful. Indeed, he regarded his wars as his chief glory. He employed a carefully reorganized army and skillful generals in a series of inexcusable attacks on his neighbors by which he not only produced all the incalculable misery at home and abroad which war always brings with it, but finally squandered all the resources of France, which Colbert had so anxiously husbanded, and brought the country to the verge of ruin.

Reason for reviewing the wars of Louis XIV

It might properly be asked at this point why, if our purpose be to explain the present, we should stop for even a short consideration of the criminal aggressions of a despotic king, who only succeeded in slightly extending the boundaries of France and whose victims — the tens of thousands who were killed, maimed, robbed, or maltreated in the battles, sieges, and

devastations to which his projects gave rise — are all dead and buried these two centuries. There is, however, a good reason for turning back to the wars of Louis XIV, far off though they may at first sight seem. They serve to introduce us to the chief actors who were to appear on the European stage and to explain their several situations, their loves and hates and rivalries, and the extent of the possessions of each, — little Holland with its vast colonial empire, its unrivaled fleet of merchantmen on the sea, its low meadows, its herds and windmills, its flourishing cities, its painters and audacious writers who continually irritated the great Louis; England with its colonial ambitions in India and North America; Germany, an empire the innumerable parts of which had almost fallen asunder; enfeebled Spain, no longer able to take rank among the formidable powers as it had a century before; scattered Austria, not yet an empire as it is to-day; Italy, the disruption of which seemed as hopeless as that of Germany.[1]

REFERENCES

The work of Richelieu and Mazarin: WAKEMAN, *European History, 1598–1715*, chap. vii, pp. 133–165; KITCHIN, *History of France*, Vol. III, pp. 73–83, 138–142; PERKINS, *Richelieu*.

Louis XIV as a man and ruler: WAKEMAN, pp. 185–194; KITCHIN, Vol. III, pp. 143–164.

The court of Louis XIV: PERKINS, *France under the Regency*, pp. 129–142.

Colbert and his reforms: PERKINS, *France under the Regency*, chap. iv, pp. 90–128; WAKEMAN, chap. i, pp. 194–205.

[1] It is scarcely necessary to say that the student must come to cherish the map, instinctively referring to it when a question of towns, rivers, and mountains or of any territorial change occurs. One who does not know the difference between Alsace and Sardinia, who is not sure whether the Danube flows into the North Sea or the Adriatic, or whether Vienna is in Prussia or Bavaria may easily fail to understand both the present and the past. In no way can we improve our geographical knowledge so readily, agreeably, and permanently as by associating it with history, for thus Versailles, Madrid, the Apennines, and the Zuider Zee become for the first time for most of us real places. So through history we learn geography and, on the other hand, without geography, history — even that which does not have to do directly with wars and treaties about land — is too vague to be worth much, too ill understood to be interesting.

CHAPTER II

EUROPE AND LOUIS XIV

LOUIS XIV'S ATTEMPT TO ANNEX THE SPANISH NETHERLANDS (1667–1668)

Natural boundaries of France

4. Louis XIV's predecessors had, on the whole, had little time to think of conquest. They had first to consolidate their realms and gain the mastery over their feudal dependents who long shared the government with them; then the claims to French territory advanced by the English Edwards and Henries had to be met, and the French provinces were finally freed from their grasp in the long and exhausting Hundred Years' War; lastly, the great religious dispute between the Catholic and Protestant parties was only settled after many years of disintegrating civil strife. But Louis was finally at liberty to look about him and consider how he might best realize the dream of his ancestors and perhaps reëstablish the ancient boundaries which Julius Cæsar reported that the Gauls had occupied. The "natural limits" of France appeared to be the great river Rhine on the north and northeast, the Jura Mountains and the Alps on the east; to the south, the Mediterranean and the mighty chain of the Pyrenees, and to the west and northwest, the Atlantic Ocean.

Extent of France in 1659

Richelieu had believed it an important part of his policy to endeavor to restore all the territory to France which Nature seemed to have assigned to her. Mazarin looked longingly toward the Rhine and sought vainly to win Savoy and Nice, which lie on the French side of the Alps.[1] But he was forced to content himself with inducing Austria, at the end of the Thirty Years' War, to cede to France such rights as she

[1] These regions were added permanently to France some two centuries later.

EUROPE
WHEN LOUIS XIV. BEGAN
HIS PERSONAL GOVERNMENT
1661
Spanish Possessions
Austrian Possessions
Extent Boundary of the Holy Roman Empire
Scale of Miles
KINGDOM OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
Scotland
Edinburgh
Ireland
Dublin
England
London
North Sea
ATLANTIC
OCEAN
KINGDOM OF
SWEDEN
Stockholm
Baltic Sea
Copenhagen
DENMARK
Amsterdam
Brussels
Berlin
Dresden
Prague
Vienna
HOLY ROMAN
EMPIRE
Bohemia
Moravia
Hungary
Austria
POLAND
Paris
Versailles
France
KINGDOM OF
FRANCE
Lyons
Milan
Venice
Florence
Grand Duchy of Tuscany
Rome
Naples
TURKISH
DOMINIONS
Constantinople
Corsica
To Genoa
Sardinia
To Spain
Balearic Isles
To Spain
Minorca
Majorca
Ivica
KINGDOM OF
SPAIN
Madrid
Barcelona
Valencia
New Castille
Old Castille
Navarre
KINGDOM OF
PORTUGAL
Lisbon
Seville
Cadiz
Gibraltar
(Spanish)
Granada
Palermo
Messina
Sicily
To Spain
Malta
Candia
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
AFRICA
Longitude West
Longitude East from Greenwich

enjoyed in Alsace. A few years later (1659), Mazarin compelled Spain to give up Artois, a few towns on the northern confines of France, and, to the south, all her trifling possessions north of the Pyrenees, — that barrier "which," as the treaty of 1659 recites, "formerly divided the Gauls from Spain."

France hemmed in by Spain in the seventeenth century

Louis's efforts to extend the boundaries of France were confined for the most part to the north and east, — to regions now occupied by France herself, by Belgium, the German Empire, and the tiny duchy of Luxemburg. But in his time the map was no such simple matter as it is to-day. France was still hemmed in by Spain on the south, north, and east, as she had been since the times of Charles V,[1] for Spain still held the southern Netherlands and Franche Comté. Then there was a maze of little duchies, counties, bishoprics, and more or less independent towns lying between France and the Rhine, belonging to the weak Holy Roman Empire.[2] Some of this region France had already added to her possessions, as will be seen on the map, and there was reason to believe that she might take advantage of the general demoralization of the Empire to add more. Paris, the French capital, seemed altogether too near the frontier; but, should Louis succeed in adding territory at the expense of Spain and the little states toward the Rhine, it might become nearly the center of an enlarged France.

Louis occupies the Spanish Netherlands and Franche Comté (1667–1668)

Louis had no difficulty in finding an excuse for beginning his aggressions. He was married to a Spanish princess, Maria Theresa. When her father died and her younger brother, Charles II, succeeded to the Spanish throne in 1665, Louis maintained that his wife, as the firstborn, was legally the

[1] It must be remembered that in 1496 the heir of the Austrian and Burgundian possessions, which included the Netherlands, married the heiress to all the Spanish realms, and that, in consequence, their son, Charles V, became ruler of a very considerable portion of western Europe. But before his death he divided his territories between his son, Philip II, to whom Spain and the Netherlands fell, and his brother, Ferdinand, who received the older Austrian possessions in Germany. See Robinson, *History of Western Europe*, pp. 355 *sq.* and 444 *sq.*

[2] See map, p. 23, below.

heiress to a great part of the Spanish Netherlands, if not to the whole Spanish realm. He had his lawyers write a book to prove this, and then ordered his troops to take possession of the Spanish Netherlands. He insolently announced that he was only about to undertake a "journey" into the region, as if his invasion was merely a visit to an undisputed portion of his territories. He easily took a few towns on the border and then turned south-east and quickly and completely conquered Franche Comté.

Spain unable to resist Louis

Notwithstanding the formidable appearance of the Spanish Empire and the traditions of power and glory handed down from the preceding century, Spain was really in no condition to resist these pretensions of Louis. The new sovereign, Charles II, was a child of only four years when he came to the throne, and a child he remained, in intellect and capacity, until his death in 1700.

Character of Charles II and his government

He is described by contemporaries as being without occupations, pleasures, education, sentiment, or the inclination to do anything serious; he could scarcely read and write; he hated the business of state, and delighted in the game of jackstraws even after reaching the years of maturity. Though king, he did not govern, but was the prey of factious nobles and ecclesiastics who were at once prodigal and without administrative capacity. The offices of state were bestowed on aristocratic favorites or sold to speculators.

State of Spanish finances

The finances of Spain were badly deranged; extravagance was regarded as a virtue, and the systematic accounting for receipts and expenditures was held worthy only of the shop-keeper. A keen observer of the time declared that, so far as the state treasury was concerned, "all was chaos, wrapped in impenetrable obscurity"; and no one wanted to straighten out the tangle. A high functionary vauntingly asserted that Spain did not wish a Colbert to reform finances because "it was beneath so great a prince as his king to live with parsimony." The pension roll was long; the revenues were decreasing and only about one fourth of the taxes remained for the

king after the pensions, interest, and charges of the collectors were paid. To meet expenses he was compelled to resort to discreditable methods; the coinage was debased; salaries were only partly paid; and the national debt was cut down by repudiations. The chief reliance was borrowing, although the prudent bankers of Genoa deemed Spain's credit so poor that they exacted an interest of from twenty-five to forty per cent. In spite of all these expedients, the poor king had to pawn his jewels and plate for personal expenses, and even then he was humiliated by finding his servants deserting him and by the refusal of his tradesmen to trust him. This poverty haunted him to the end.

Weakness of military and naval defenses

Under such circumstances it was only natural that the military and naval defenses of the Spanish possessions should be neglected. The army and navy had been worn out in the Thirty Years' War. The war footing of the army amounted to less than twenty thousand effective soldiers; the old military spirit was gone, pay was in arrears, and the soldiers were reduced to rags and beggary. Nobles would serve only in high places, and there were more generals than regiments. The ocean-going fleet had less than a dozen ships in good fighting condition, and the coast defenses were so defective that the pirates could not be kept off.

The government only reflected the general condition of the country. The gold which flowed in from the colonies, instead of building up Spanish industry and commerce, really checked them, inasmuch as it encouraged idleness and extravagance among the upper classes who disdained mercantile pursuits. The population, which now numbers some eighteen millions, was then but four or five millions; foreigners controlled the manufactures in a large measure; literature had almost perished; and only the Church showed an increase in wealth and in the number of officials. An Italian ambassador declared: "There is no state in Christendom where the ecclesiastics absorb more of the public revenues, or where religious orders are more numerous."

The United Provinces, England, and Sweden combine to check Louis

The evident inability of Spain to check the operations of the French king threw that burden upon other countries whose interests led them to be alarmed by his high-handed policy of territorial aggrandizement. The encroachments of Louis especially affected the Dutch, for if he succeeded in annexing the Spanish Netherlands, the borders of France would touch those of the Dutch United Provinces; the river Scheldt and the port of Antwerp would be in the hands of the French, and thus Dutch trade would be gravely menaced. Thoroughly aroused to the serious dangers, the Dutch turned to Sweden and England for assistance, and in 1668 the three countries agreed to go to war, if necessary, in order to force Louis to relinquish his pretensions.

Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1668

This formidable combination quickly brought the French monarch to terms, and he consented, in the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, to return Franche Comté and the Netherlands to Spain on condition that he might retain about a dozen towns on the north, which gave him a long line of fortresses for frontier defense.

Louis XIV's War against the Dutch (1672–1678)

5. The treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle left Louis XIV smarting under the humiliation that he had received through the interference of the Dutch. This little people had forced him to relinquish the Spanish provinces when he had them already in his grasp. He heartily abhorred their Protestantism, their republican tendencies, and their willingness to harbor all the writers and printers who directed attacks against him and against the idea of monarchy by the grace of God. Once their seven provinces had belonged to Spain, and France had helped them to win their independence. Now, instead of favoring their former ally, they raised the duties on French products, and opposed the development of the French navy and the acquisition by France of the Spanish Netherlands.


THE NETHERLANDS
IN 1661
0 25 50
Scale of Miles
Texel
FRIESLAND
GRONINGEN
Groningen
DRENTHE
ZUYDER ZEE
Amsterdam
OVERYSSEL
COUNTRY OF DENTHUM
Leyden
The Hague
Ryswick
Delft
Rotterdam
Rhine
Utrecht
UTRECHT
GELDERLAND
BISHOPRIC OF MUNSTER
Nimwegen
CLEVES
ZEELAND
COMMON LANDS
FLANDERS
Ghent
Antwerp
Scheldt
SPANISH
Brussels
BRABANT
HENNEGAU
Meuse
BISHOPRIC OF LIEGE
ARCHIE OF COLOGNE
DUCHY OF BERG
DUCHY OF JÜLICH
Aix la Chapelle
Cologne
Liege
DUCHY OF LUXEMBURG
ARCHIE OF TREVES
KINGDOM OF FRANCE
Soissons
Luxemburg
Treves
UNITED NETHERLANDS

It seemed consequently both an agreeable and an easy undertaking to crush this confederation of merchants whose whole low, muddy territory did not equal a fifteenth part of the great king's realm.

Extent and organization of the United Netherlands

The United Netherlands was composed of those seven provinces, lying in a circle around the Zuider Zee, which had successfully combined, a century earlier, to free themselves from Spanish oppression.[1] They differed greatly in their laws and in the character and occupations of their inhabitants, and were bound together as loosely as possible, so that each of the members of the union had a right to veto any important measure. The most influential province was Holland with its vast commerce and its celebrated cities of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Delft, Leyden, and The Hague, which was the seat of government of the united provinces. We commonly refer to the present kingdom of the Netherlands as "Holland," although strictly speaking that is the name of only one province. In the time of Louis XIV the United Netherlands included about the same area as the Dutch kingdom of to-day, which is larger than Massachusetts, but only a quarter the size of the state of New York.[2]

Nature of political troubles in the United Netherlands

The political troubles in the United Netherlands were due first, to the weakness of the federal congress, the Estates General, in which even the most salutary measures could be defeated by the vote of the representatives of a single province; secondly, to the natural anxiety of Holland to control the affairs of the whole union; thirdly, to the ambition of the descendants of the founder of Dutch liberty, William of Orange, called the Silent, to establish themselves as kings in fact if not in name.

1 See Robinson, *History of Western Europe*, pp. 446 *sq.*

2 It will be observed on the map that the seven provinces — Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland, Overijssel, Groningen, and Friesland — did not constitute the whole territory of the Confederation, but that there was an eighth, half-dependent, province of Drenthe, besides certain lands to the south, which the union held in common and which were not organized as provinces.

Importance of the House of Orange

Each province had a governor or *stadholder*,[1] and as William the Silent owed his power nominally to the fact that he was chosen stadholder by several provinces, so his sons and grandson had the same distinction accorded to them, in grateful recognition of all that the Dutch people owed to the family.

William of Orange (b. 1650, d. 1702)

When Louis XIV began his attack on the provinces, the great grandson of William the Silent, a young man of twenty-two, was the representative of the House of Orange. His enemies, who were in authority at the time, disliked the thought of a strong central power and declared that each province was of right a sovereign republic. But the threatening attitude of Louis XIV and the actual approach of the French troops speedily convinced the Dutch that the provinces must stand together. Every one looked to the descendant of William the Silent for safety in the terrible crisis, and William, Prince of Orange, was chosen commander general of all the troops. He was also appointed hereditary stadholder by some of the more important provinces, beginning with Holland, and while he never became king, he so increased the powers of the stadholder that the Netherlands ceased to be a republic except in name.

The Dutch stadholder practically king

Louis wins the former allies of the Dutch

The ease with which Louis's ambassadors were able to turn against the Dutch all of their former allies casts a sad enough light upon the unscrupulous diplomacy of the time. Charles II of England was induced to join Louis by the promise of money which would enable him to amuse himself in his rather expensive fashion without resorting to Parliament. Sweden, the Emperor, and some of the more important German princes also agreed, in return for money or possible territorial gains, to support Louis. Consequently the Dutch seemed to have no chance of opposing the powerful army which Louis sent around well to the east so as to escape crossing the various

[1] The stadholder, or "stead-holder," as his title may be translated, was originally the lieutenant, or representative, of the King of Spain.

streams which barred the direct way to the provinces. By this route he also kept out of the Spanish Netherlands and so avoided giving Spain any cause for intervening.

The French invade Holland in 1672, but soon evacuate it

In June, 1672, the French were not far east of Amsterdam, and the city expected to have to surrender every moment. The Dutch were ready to conclude peace and offered to cede the southern portions of their territory to France and pay the expenses of the war. Louis, however, asked still more land and money, and demanded, moreover, that the Dutch should reëstablish the Catholic religion on the same footing with the Protestant, and should each year send a solemn embassy to thank him "for having left to the United Provinces the independence which the kings his predecessors had caused them to acquire." These outrageous demands only strengthened the power of William of Orange, who cut the dikes and put a part of the country under water in order to drive out the French; and after a vain attempt on their part to take Amsterdam on the ice during the winter of 1672–1673, they evacuated Holland.

William of Orange organizes a "grand alliance" against France

William of Orange now became the leader of the European opposition to France. Both as stadholder of the Dutch provinces and later as king of England, he was to be the stanch and unwavering enemy of Louis and the most serious obstacle in his path. Young as he was, William exhibited the capacity for leadership, diplomacy, and dogged perseverance which had shown itself in his ancestors. He induced Louis's recent allies to desert him and organized against the too powerful France a "grand alliance," including Spain, the Emperor, the elector of Brandenburg, and other German princes. England, which had never sympathized with its king's love for Louis, became neutral, leaving only Sweden to support France.

Peace of Nimwegen, 1678

When, at the end of six years of intermittent hostilities, a general peace was concluded at Nimwegen, the chief provisions were that France should not only leave the United Netherlands intact but should pledge herself to protect the Dutch

Franche Comté goes to France

merchants and their commerce. France, however, was finally permitted to annex some northern towns and Franche Comté, over which she and Spain had been quarreling for a century and a half.

Louis XIV's Plan of encroaching by "Reunions" upon the Holy Roman Empire

"Reunions" on the German borders

6. Although there was no open war for ten years to follow, Louis found a way to encroach steadily upon the Spanish Netherlands and the German territories which lay between him and the Rhine. Franche Comté and certain towns which had been ceded to him by Spain were, by the terms of the treaty, to include "all their territories, domains, seigneuries, appurtenances, dependencies, and annexes by whatsoever title they might be designated, as well as all the men, vassals, subjects, towns, burgs, villages, hamlets, forests, streams, country districts, salt marshes, and all other things connected with them." These innumerable vestiges of ancient feudal entanglements gave the king of France ample opportunity for extending his claims by reuniting former "dependencies." To carry out these "reunions," as they were called, courts were organized with the special purpose of determining what should of right come to France and, under the king's supervision, they naturally put a liberal construction on the cessions made by the treaty of Nimwegen. Where towns resisted, French troops were sent to bombard them. The Spanish protests received no attention.

Similar uncertainty as to the exact extent of the cessions made to France by the Peace of Westphalia (1648) and by later treaties, led to far more considerable extensions of Louis's power at the expense of the German states on his borders. His courts turned half rights into whole in Alsace, and French troops seized the important city of Strassburg (1681), to which Louis had no claim whatever. In 1684 the diet of the Empire


ABBREVIATIONS
Abp.....Archbishopric
Bp.....Bishopric
C.....County
D.....Duchy
El.....Electorate
K.....Kingdom
Ldg., L.....Landgraviate
Mg.....Margraviate
Pr.....Principality
BALTIC SEA
NORTH SEA
Königsberg
Danzig
Lübeck
Hamburg
DUCHY OF MECKLENBURG
Stettin
Bremen
DUCHY OF LÜNEBURG
ELECTORATE BRANDENBURG
Berlin
KINGDOM OF POLAND
Posen
Warsaw
Amsterdam
Rotterdam
Magdeburg
Leipzig
ELECTORATE SAXONY
Dresden
Breslau
Antwerp
Brussels
Liege
Cologne
Aachen
Frankfort
Krakow
KINGDOM OF BOHEMIA
Prague
Nuremberg
Metz
Strasburg
Stuttgart
KINGDOM OF FRANCE
ELECTORATE PALATINATE
ARCHDUCHY OF AUSTRIA
Vienna
Salzburg
Bern
SWITZERLAND
Milan
Turin
Venice
THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE
in the Age of Louis XIV
SCALE OF MILES
Boundary of the Empire
Territories of Brandenburg Line of Hohenzollern
Territories of Austrian Hapsburgs
Territories of Spanish Habsburgs
Ecclesiastical Territories
Chief Imperial Free Cities
The boundaries of the various States are shown as they were delineated at the Treaty of Westphalia, 1648. Many minor states, ecclesiastical and lay, and free towns are necessarily omitted.

was induced to ratify the French occupation of Strassburg and of nearly all the territories which had been adjudged to Louis by his courts.

Contrast between the present German Empire and the "Germanies" of the seventeenth century

Almost two centuries later Germany was able, as we shall see, to wreak a terrible vengeance upon France and to regain not only Strassburg but the whole of Alsace. But no European state has changed since the time of Louis XIV so completely as Germany, which means to us the German Empire, one of the three or four best organized of the great European powers. It is now a compact federation somewhat like that of the United States, made up of twenty-two monarchies and three city republics. Each member of the union manages its local affairs but leaves all questions of national importance to be settled by the central government at Berlin. Nothing could be more different from this than the "Germanies" — as the French called them — of the seventeenth century. And in order to understand the ease with which Louis appropriated bits of German territory and the alliances which he was constantly making with individual German rulers, we must pause a moment to consider that very anomalous thing known as the Holy Roman Empire.

The Holy Roman Empire

In spite of its fine name and long history, it scarcely deserved to be ranked among the states of Europe. The great mediæval emperors, like Henry IV and Frederick Barbarossa, had never succeeded in getting the better of their powerful vassals and binding together their territories into a firm monarchy such as France had become. On the contrary, the central power had grown weaker and weaker, while the various dukes, counts, bishops, abbots, and free towns went their own way, paying less and less attention to the Emperor, coining their own money, raising their own taxes, and, for that matter, fighting their own battles, — for each state was permitted to conclude treaties with other countries as if it were independent.

The Emperor, who regarded himself as the successor of the Roman emperors, was selected in a peculiar manner. He did

Selection of the Emperor by eight "electors"

not inherit the crown, but was chosen by a few of the German rulers who had long enjoyed this right and were consequently called "electors." As they often appear in history, it is well worth while to remember their names. There were first, the three ecclesiastical electors, — the archbishops of Mayence, of Treves, and of Cologne, — who were not only prelates but princes, whose possessions lay upon the Rhine and who had consequently much to do with France. Close to them, geographically, was the elector of the Palatinate; then, further east, the elector of Saxony, and, to the north, the elector of Brandenburg, who was soon (1700) to assume the title of King of Prussia. The seventh elector was the king of Bohemia[1]. Lastly there was the duke of Bavaria, who had managed during the troubles of the Thirty Years' War to have himself recognized as a new elector.

The imperial office had long been held by the Austrian ruler

Although the Empire was not hereditary, it had been so in practice for some two hundred and fifty years, since the electors had been accustomed to select as Emperor the ruler of the Austrian dominions. They were free, however, at any time to choose some one else, and Francis I of France, Henry VIII of England, and other foreign candidates had occasionally had some hopes of securing the imperial crown. Even Louis XIV was induced at one time to make an effort to have himself chosen Emperor and spent some money in gaining the good will of the electors.

The imperial diet

The Empire had a general congress, or diet, to which the various members of the union sent representatives and which met at Ratisbon on the Danube. It had little power and was so badly organized and so slow in its proceedings that business dragged along literally for centuries. The Emperor, as emperor, had little or no steady revenue, and the imperial army was made up of contingents from the various states, which came together very reluctantly and tardily. Consequently, although

[1] This title had been held for some time by the Emperor himself, since Bohemia formed a part of the Austrian dominions.

one hears of the Empire entering into treaties of alliance, participating in wars and concluding treaties of peace, it must be remembered that no one, not even the diet or the Emperor himself, had any particular interest in the Empire, but that everything really depended upon the individual German princes, among whom the ruler of the Austrian territories was the most important.

Possessions of the Austrian ruler

The House of Hapsburg, to which the Austrian territories belonged, and which had so long held the office of Emperor, had slowly accumulated its various kingdoms, duchies, counties, etc., by conquest, inheritance, intrigue, and fortunate marriages, running back into the Middle Ages. In the treaty of Nimwegen with France, the Emperor is called "Most serene and mighty Lord Leopold, Emperor elect[1] of the Romans, ever august, King of Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, Archduke of Austria, Duke of Burgundy, Brabant, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Margrave of Moravia, Duke of Luxemburg, of Upper and Lower Silesia, Würtemberg and Teck, Prince of Suabia, Count of Hapsburg, Tyrol, Kyburg and Goritz, etc., etc." Some minor possessions are here modestly omitted, but, on the other hand, Leopold's title, King of Germany, was meaningless, and Louis XIV protested against his still calling himself duke of Burgundy since the duchy of Burgundy had belonged to France for over a century.

The Turks and other eastern interests of Austria

As for Hungary, that was in the hands of the Turks with whom the Hapsburg princes had been warring for two centuries. Just at this period (1683) the Mohammedans were besieging Vienna itself, which was only saved by the timely intervention of the Polish king. After this defeat, however, the power of the Turks rapidly declined, and the Hapsburgs were able in 1699 to force the Sultan to acknowledge their title to

[1] This title "emperor elect" meant that the Emperor had been chosen by the electors but had not as yet been crowned by the pope. It was first assumed by Maximilian in 1580 with the Pope's permission, and after his time no emperor ever went to Rome to be crowned by the Pope, as had been the custom earlier, but they continued to use the title, *imperator electus*.

Hungary. It was but natural that the eyes of the Emperor should be turned rather to the east than to the west, since his realms lay mainly to the east of Germany proper and his capital was Vienna, not Ratisbon where the diet met, nor Frankfurt-on-the-Main where the imperial elections took place.

Importance of elector of Brandenburg

While the Austrian ruler was holding together as best he could his motley aggregation of kingdoms, duchies, counties, and principalities, inhabited by Germans, Bohemians, Slavonians, and Hungarians, the elector of Brandenburg was laying the foundation of a kingdom which was to become Austria's greatest rival and finally the center of the new German Empire from which she has been excluded. Beginning with a strip of territory extending some ninety miles to the east and to the west of the then little town of Berlin, the successive rulers of the House of Hohenzollern have gradually extended their boundaries until the present kingdom of Prussia extends all the way across Germany and embraces nearly two thirds of the present German Empire.

Frederick William, the Great Elector, 1640–1688

The development of Prussia will be described below.[1] Suffice it to say here that it was in the time of Louis XIV that Brandenburg began to play an important part in European affairs. The Great Elector, as he is still honorably designated by Prussians, who reigned from 1640 to 1688, had joined England and Holland in their alliances against Louis, for he was interested in the fate of his territories on the Rhine, Mark and Cleves. He organized an army out of all proportion to his resources and therewith started his country on the way to military glory.

Lesser states of the Holy Roman Empire

As for the rest of the states included in the Holy Roman Empire, two or three hundred in number, they differed widely in size and character. One had a duke, another a count at its head, while others were ruled by prelates, archbishops, bishops, or by the heads of monasteries, — abbots, abbesses, and priors. There were many cities like Nuremberg, Augsburg, Frankfort,

[1] See below, sect. 12.

Worms, and Cologne, which were just as independent as Bavaria, Würtemberg, or Saxony. Lastly there were the imperial knights whose whole possessions might consist of a single strong castle with a wretched village lying at its base. The burgravate of Reineck[1] is said to have included one castle and twelve poor subjects; the standing army of Count Leimburg-Styrum-Wilhelmsdorf[1] was composed of one colonel, nine other officers, and two privates.

Weakness and minute subdivision of Germany illustrated by Lorraine and Alsace

Now it so happened that it was the southwestern portion of the Empire on both sides of the Rhine and nearest France that were most broken up into weak and helpless little principalities. It is no wonder that Louis was encouraged to add, bit by bit, through war or courts of "reunion," the region between France and the Rhine where he already had so many little "enclaves," or islands of territory. Next to the French boundary lay the duchy of Lorraine, whose duke suffered so much from Louis that he finally took service in the Austrian army. Three bishopries within his domain — Metz, Verdun, and Toul — had been in the hands of France for a century or more. Alsace, before portions of it were ceded to France in 1648, was divided into some forty independent or dependent little countries, not including the ninety villages of the knights. There were the bishopric of Strassburg, the realms of several abbots and counts, and ten independent towns besides the great free city of Strassburg.

Louis's other German neighbors

To the north of Alsace lay the ragged possessions of the elector of the Palatinate which Louis hoped to add to France; east and west of him were the lands of the ecclesiastical electors of Mayence and Treves, still farther down the Rhine those of the elector of Cologne, and near him the Prussian duchy of Cleves. To the west of Cologne was the duchy of Jülich and then right in the midst of the Spanish Netherlands the bishopric of Liége. Besides these there were other territories,

[1] The reader will search the map in vain for these and other equally insignificant places too small to be indicated.

some too small to appear on even a good map. It will be clear that it is almost impossible to give with any exactness the number of countries which went to make up the singular union known as the Holy Roman Empire. The manner in which Germany finally consolidated itself under the influence of French aggression, which by no means ceased with the death of Louis XIV, will prove one of the most important chapters in this volume.

The English Revolution of 1688 and the War of the League of Augsburg (1688–1697)

7. The "reunions" by which Louis increased the French possessions naturally attracted the attention of his enemies, — the Emperor, William of Orange, the king of Spain, and other rulers whose apprehensions were aroused. A new coalition was therefore preparing against Louis when two startling acts on his part consolidated a great part of Europe against him.

Position of the Huguenots

The first of these was the revocation of the Edict of Nantes which Louis XIV's grandfather, Henry IV, had granted to the Huguenots, as the French Protestants were called. Since they were heretics and as such abhorred by the Catholics, they had no rights except those which the king explicitly accorded them, and to revoke the edict was to make all Protestants outlaws. When the Huguenots were deprived by Richelieu of their former dangerous military independence, they had turned to manufacture, trade, and banking, and "as rich as a Huguenot" had become a proverb in France. There were perhaps a million of them among the fifteen million Frenchmen, and they undoubtedly formed by far the most thrifty and enterprising part of the nation. The Catholic clergy, however, continued to urge the complete suppression of heresy.

Louis XIV had scarcely taken the reins of government into his own hands before the perpetual nagging and injustice to

which the Protestants had been subjected at all times took a more serious form. Upon one pretense or another their churches were demolished. Children were authorized to renounce Protestantism when they reached the age of seven, and might be taken from their parents to be brought up in a Catholic school. In this way Protestant families were pitilessly broken up. Rough and licentious dragoons were quartered upon the Huguenots in the hope that the insulting behavior of the soldiers might drive the heretics to accept the religion of the king.

Louis's policy of suppressing Protestantism

At last Louis was led by his officials to believe that practically all the Huguenots had been converted by these drastic measures, and in 1685 he accordingly revoked the Edict of Nantes. The Protestants became outlaws, and their ministers subject to the penalty of death if they continued to perform their duties. But even liberal-minded Catholics, like La Fontaine, the kindly writer of fables, and Madame de Sévigné, hailed the reëstablishment of "religious unity" with delight. They honestly believed that only an insignificant and seditious remnant still clung to the beliefs of Calvin. But there could have been no more serious mistake. Thousands of the Huguenots succeeded in eluding the vigilance of the royal officials and fled, — some to the Dutch Netherlands, some to England, some to Brandenburg, some to America, — carrying with them their skill and industry to strengthen the rivals of France.[1]

Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685)

This revival of ancient fanaticism made a deep impression upon the Protestant powers, especially the Dutch Netherlands, England, and Brandenburg. They had all, at one time or another, been in league with France, but now they all turned against her. Nevertheless, the French king, as if to still further increase the strength and unanimity of his enemies, in the same year that he revoked the Edict of Nantes, laid claim

Louis XIV lays claim to the Palatinate in his sister-in-law's name

[1] This was the last great and terrible example of that fierce religious intolerance which had produced the Albigensian Crusade, the Spanish Inquisition, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. See Robinson, *History of Western Europe*, pp. 223, 358, and 455.

to the Palatinate in the name of his sister-in-law, Charlotte Elizabeth.[1]

The League of Augsburg

In 1686 the German powers signed an alliance known as the League of Augsburg, which was joined by Spain and the Dutch. Catholics and Protestants alike were ready to fight side by side in order to check the boundless insolence of the French king. Moreover a singular revolution soon greatly increased the strength and resources of Louis's chief adversary, William of Orange, for in 1688 he became king of England.

James II (1685–1688)

Upon the death of Charles II of England, who had been very friendly with Louis, he was succeeded by his brother James, who was an avowed Catholic and had married, as his second wife, Mary of Modena, also a Catholic. He was ready to reëstablish Catholicism in England, regardless of consequences. Mary, James's daughter by his first wife, had married William, prince of Orange, the head of the United Netherlands. The nation, therefore, might have tolerated James so long as they could look forward to the accession of his Protestant daughter Mary. But when a son was born to his Catholic second wife, and James showed unmistakably his purpose of favoring the Catholics, messengers were dispatched by a group of Protestants to William of Orange, asking him to come over with his English wife and be their ruler.[2]

[1] Louis's younger brother, the duke of Orleans, had married Charlotte Elizabeth, the sister of the elector of the Palatinate, who had died without male heirs in 1685. It was this fact that gave Louis his excuse for intervening to win the Palatinate for her. She is well known on account of the amusing letters which she was accustomed to write to her many German friends about the happenings at the French court.

[2] The Revolution of 1688 in England, which called William to the throne, was the culmination of a struggle between the monarchs and the people which had been in progress since the accession of James I in 1603. It originated in the extravagant claim of that king that unlimited authority was vested in him and that he could tax his people without the consent of Parliament. A great number of his subjects, especially the Puritans, who were dissatisfied with the church as established under Elizabeth, resisted the pretensions of the sovereign and, under Charles I, a civil war broke out which was only ended by the execution of the king. A military despotism under Cromwell was then set up; but the very violence of the revolutionists, combined with the innate loyalty of the English people,

The English Revolution of 1688 and the accession of William III

William landed in England, November, 1688, and marched upon London, where he received general support from all the English Protestants, regardless of party. James started to oppose William, but his army refused to fight, and his courtiers deserted him. William was glad to forward James's escape to France, as he would hardly have known what to do with him had James insisted on remaining in the country. A new parliament declared the throne vacant, on the ground that King James II, "having violated the fundamental laws and withdrawn himself out of the kingdom, had abdicated the government."

Effects of the English Revolution

By this peaceful revolution the English rid themselves of the Stuart kings and their claims to rule, like the French kings, by the grace of God. Moreover both Charles II and James II had been Catholics and had threatened to reëstablish their religion against the wishes of the majority of the people. They had both been in constant friendly communication with the French king who favored this plan. Now all was changed. William was unmistakably Protestant and already the head of a Protestant state; he had come at the bidding of representatives of the people and governed in virtue of an

brought about a restoration in the person of Charles II, a son of the "martyred ruler," as Charles I was now called. Though a Catholic at heart and opposed therefore to the Protestant church as established by law, and though firmly believing in divine right, Charles II was determined not to risk losing his head, like his father, and succeeded, by dissimulating his views, in keeping his throne until his death in 1685. See Robinson, *History of Western Europe*, chap. xxx.



act of Parliament,[1] not by the grace of God. Having the people with him, he easily defeated the attempts which James, with Louis's assistance, made to regain his throne.

England joins the League of Augsburg

The effects of the English Revolution were important in their influence upon the course of European affairs, for under William's leadership England immediately joined the League of Augsburg. He was thus able to combine the resources of the Dutch and the English against his arch-enemy, the French king, who made a momentous mistake by occupying the Palatinate in the interests of his sister-in-law, instead of opposing William's designs on England.

The French occupy and then devastate the Palatinate (1688–1689)

France now stood alone against Europe and was really in no condition to begin a new war, for her treasury was empty, her people burdened with taxes, and her best generals dead. Nevertheless Louis seized the Palatinate and the electorate of Cologne where he was trying to establish his own candidate as archbishop. He also sent his fleet to support James II in his attempt to regain his English throne. In 1689 Louis justified the worst apprehensions of his enemies by a frightful devastation of the Palatinate which he had decided to evacuate. He burned whole towns, destroyed the castles, including the beautiful residence of the elector of the Palatinate at Heidelberg, the magnificent ruins of which stand as a reminder of this cruel attempt to destroy permanently the prosperity of one of the most beautiful and flourishing districts of Germany. Mannheim was ruined by fire and gunpowder, Speyer and Worms destroyed, and the country ravaged as Sherman ravaged Georgia on his famous march to the sea. Though this was defended as a war measure, the ancient

[1] A "Declaration of Right" was drawn up condemning James's violation of the constitution and appointing William and Mary joint sovereigns. This is a monument in English constitutional history since it once more restated the limitations upon the king which had been imposed by Magna Carta and the Petition of Right drawn up in the time of Charles I. The Declaration bound the king not to levy taxes, or keep a standing army, or suspend the laws without the consent of Parliament, which should enjoy freedom of speech and be assembled frequently. See Robinson, *Readings in European History*, Vol. II, pp. 221 and 261.

grudge of the Germans against France may even to-day be aroused by the sight of the ivy-grown walls which still crown many a hill in the region desolated by Louis's minister of war, the heartless Louvois.

The treaties of Ryswick, 1697

The war dragged on by land and sea for nearly a decade until at last, in 1697, France, England, the United Netherlands, and the Empire signed the treaties of Ryswick. The chief provisions of these will serve to recall the main issues which have been alluded to in this chapter. Louis surrendered practically all the places (except Strassburg) that he had occupied since the treaty of Nimwegen and agreed to recognize William III as king of England, to make no effort to depose him, and to ratify as William's successor his wife's sister, Anne, a stanch Protestant, thus assuring the exclusion of Catholics from the English throne. He restored Lorraine to its rightful ruler, evacuated the right bank of the Rhine, withdrew his candidate for the electorate of Cologne, and accepted a sum of money in lieu of his sister-in-law's claims on the Palatinate.

REFERENCES

Louis XIV's First Attempt on the Spanish Netherlands: WAKEMAN, *European History, 1598–1715*, pp. 207–214; KITCHIN, *History of France*, Vol. III, pp. 165–174.

The United Provinces in the Seventeenth Century: WAKEMAN, pp. 216–234.

Louis XIV's First War on Holland: WAKEMAN, pp. 235–248; KITCHIN, Vol. III, pp. 175–211; TRAILL, *William III*, pp. 1–16.

The Holy Roman Empire: WAKEMAN, pp. 7–11.

The Religious Policy of Louis XIV: WAKEMAN, pp. 248–259; KITCHIN, Vol. III, pp. 224–236; PERKINS, *France under the Regency*, pp. 164–208.

The Revolution of 1688 in England: CHEYNEY, *Short History of England*, pp. 498–515; TRAILL, pp. 17–66; GREEN, *Short History of the English People*, chap. ix, pp. 661–683; LEE, *Source Book of English History*, pp. 417–442.

Turkey in the Eighteenth Century: WAKEMAN, pp. 266–289.

CHAPTER III

RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE AT UTRECHT

The Question of the Spanish Succession

8. The willingness of Louis XIV to conclude the Peace of Ryswick, by which he gained so little, is to be explained in part by his anxiety to be ready for a new crisis in European affairs which he and his fellow-monarchs had long foreseen. This was the struggle that was sure to arise when Charles II, the feeble king of Spain, should die. He had neither children nor brothers to whom his vast realms would naturally revert. A successor had therefore to be sought among his more distant kin.

Origin of the French and Austrian claims to the Spanish throne

His father's elder sister had married the French king, Louis XIII, and the younger sister, the Emperor, Ferdinand III, so it had come about that Louis XIV was Charles's cousin, as was also the reigning Emperor (and head of the Austrian house), Leopold I. Matters were further complicated by the circumstance that Charles's own elder sister had married Louis, and his younger, Emperor Leopold, so that it was inevitable that each of these rulers would lay claim to the whole or part of the Spanish possessions either in his own name or in that of his children. Both monarchs, however, were well aware that the other powers of Europe would never permit either of them or the heir to the French or the Austrian crown to become king of Spain and thus found an empire of unprecedented extent. Louis therefore designated his younger grandson, Philip of Anjou, as the rightful successor of Charles II, while Leopold worked in the interests of his younger son, the Archduke Charles.[1]

[1] As the accompanying genealogical table indicates, the situation had originally been complicated by the fact that Charles II's younger sister and Leopold

Extent of the Spanish possessions

The vital interest of Europe in the settlement of the question becomes apparent as we enumerate the more important of the twenty-two crowns that Charles was so soon to lay down. Besides the kingdoms of Castile, Aragon, and Navarre with their dependencies (which embraced all the peninsula except Portugal), a great part of Italy belonged to the Spanish ruler, namely, Naples, Sicily, Sardinia, the duchy of Milan and certain coast towns,[1] while to the north of France lay the Spanish Netherlands, and on the coast of Africa were other Spanish holdings. But all these territories dwindle into insignificance when compared with Spain's magnificent colonial empire. This embraced, far to the east, the Philippine Archipelago and the Caroline Islands; to the west — thanks to Columbus — Cuba, Porto Rico, and Trinidad. In North America, Spain controlled Florida, Mexico, Texas, and claimed, indeed, all the great

had a daughter who married the elector of Bavaria. Their son, Joseph Ferdinand, was the candidate favored by poor Charles himself, but the boy's death in 1699 reduced the chief claimants to the two mentioned in the text.


France
Spain
Austria (and Bavaria)
Philip III, king of Spain (d. 1621)
Anna, m. Louis XIII
Philip IV (d. 1665)
Maria, m. Emp. Ferdinand III
Louis XIV, m. *Maria Theresa*
Charles II (d. 1700)
Margaret, m. Leopold I (d. 1705)
Louis the Dauphin (d. 1711)
Maria, m. elector of Bavaria
Louis (d. 1712)
PHILIP, duke of Anjou (as king of Spain, Philip V)
Joseph Ferdinand (d. 1699)
Louis XV
Joseph* (Emperor, 1705–1711)
ARCHDUKE* CHARLES (Emperor, 1711–1740)

* Joseph and Archduke Charles were sons of Leopold I by his third wife, Eleanor of Neuburg.

[1] See map, p. 14.

unexplored West. Central America was hers, and all of South America except Brazil, which belonged to the Portuguese.[1]

European history broadens into world history

The Spanish succession was not then a matter of the Spanish kingdom, of a duchy here and there, or a few walled towns which might come into the hands of one European ruler rather than another. The question whether the French king should annex certain fortresses on his northern border, or extend his control over the Alsatian towns, sank into the background. The whole world was now in a sense involved and even the fate of nations yet unborn. The history of Europe was broadening out. The king to whom Madrid, Naples, Milan, and Antwerp should fall was also to be feared — especially by the merchants — as the ruler of Manila, Havana, and Valparaiso.

Both the French and the Austrian claims threaten the European balance of power

Nothing need be said here of the relative strength of the claims made by the French king on the one hand and by the Emperor on the other. Too much was at stake to permit the European powers to leave the matter to be settled by diplomats and lawyers. Should the duke of Anjou succeed to the Spanish throne, on condition that he would give up forever all rights to the French crown, there was no assurance that his promise would be kept. Even if it were, the two branches of the House of Bourbon[2] might combine their strength to the detriment of the rest of Europe. If, on the other hand, Leopold's son should be awarded the prize, there was the risk of a revival of the dangerously extensive empire of Charles V; for the Archduke Charles might, by the death of his older brother, become heir to the Austrian territories and the most natural candidate for the imperial crown.[3]

Importance of trade with the Spanish colonies

Important as were the issues in the disposal of Spain's European lands and interested as were both England and Holland in maintaining a certain balance of power among

[1] See below, sect. 19.

[2] Henry IV had been the first of the Bourbon family, to which all the succeeding kings of France belonged.

[3] And so it happened, for Charles was elected Emperor in 1711.

the European states, it is probable that they would have hesitated to go to war in support of any particular candidate for the Spanish throne had it not been for the New World and the wealth-bringing trade carried on between the European ports and those of the West Indies, Mexico, and South America.

No "open door"

It is true that Spain had done all she could to keep this trade entirely in her own hands. Columbus had sailed away to the west under the auspices of the queen of Castile, and consequently Castile proposed to retain for herself all the advantages of his discoveries and those of his successors. The idea of the "open door," which would have permitted all shipowners to sail freely back and forth from Dutch, English, or Portuguese ports to Havana, Vera Cruz, or Porto Bello, was unheard of in those days. Castile looked upon her lucky find as a gold prospector would look upon the discovery of a rich claim which he would scarcely expect to share with his less fortunate neighbors.

How Spain tried to monopolize trade

At first Spain forbade all foreign vessels to enter American waters, and Spanish merchants were ordered not to carry on business with traders of other European nations without the express permission of the king. Even in Spain only one port, Seville, was allowed to engage in trade with the colonies. All ships bound for America must leave from that port and must deliver their goods there on their return.[1] For a time Vera Cruz and Porto Bello were the only colonial ports through which trade could be conducted with Spanish America. Moreover all ships were required to sail in fleets with regular convoys which made but very few trips a year. This was doubtless necessary when piracy and buccaneering were rife, but the system was maintained, like other restrictions, with the view of keeping the trade in the hands of the companies in which the government had vested it.

[1] Not until 1778 were the special privileges granted to Seville, and later to three or four other towns, abolished and business opened to all Spanish ports.

Why Spain could not maintain her monopoly

Spain was, however, unable to defend her monopoly. In the first place, she could not cover the broad Atlantic with guards and watch every inlet and landing place along the interminable coasts of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea. Moreover her home industries were not so flourishing that she was able to supply her colonies with all that they needed, and so they gladly conducted a secret and illicit trade with the merchants who came to them from England and Holland.

The English and Dutch smuggling trade

These conditions had produced a curious species of trader, — half merchant, half pirate, and necessarily always a smuggler, — who sailed the Spanish main[1] ready, when unduly tempted, to sink a Spanish convoy and capture the unwieldy galleons laden with treasure. The English seamen of Elizabeth's time, — Drake, Hawkins, and others, — had ranged the high seas, first visiting the west coast of Africa to capture a cargo of negroes who could be sold for slaves in the Spanish colonies.[2] When war existed between Spain and her European neighbors her merchants naturally fared worse than usual, for it was considered patriotic as well as profitable to attack her ships. But smuggling flourished at all times, and it is supposed that by the eighteenth century England was carrying on illegally a more considerable trade with the Spanish colonies than did the mother country through her regular channels.

The Bourbon claims a menace to English and Dutch commerce

It was these commercial interests that gave the question of the Spanish succession its chief importance for the English; for should France obtain the vacant Spanish throne for a member of her reigning house, she would doubtless take pains to assure to herself all possible advantages in the trade with the Spanish colonies, and she would be able to supply the

[1] The term "Spanish main" meant perhaps originally the mainland of Central and South America as contrasted with the West Indies, but it is commonly applied to the neighboring waters, especially the Caribbean Sea.

[2] This trade has been the subject of many romances. Some idea of it may be had from the reports of those who actually sailed the Spanish main. See *Readings*, sect. 19.

necessary military and naval forces to aid Spain in keeping out intruders as never before. Nor was it only the western trade that was involved; for should France obtain control, even indirectly, of Spain and southern Italy, she could exclude English merchants from their intercourse with the Levant (as the eastern Mediterranean regions were called), a calamity which England must avoid at any cost.

Will of Charles II, and War of the Spanish Succession

Plans for partitioning the Spanish heritage

9. The vast interests at stake and the danger of a world-wide war had led the European powers to attempt a peaceful partition of the Spanish dominions while Charles was still living. Several plans for a division of the heritage were suggested and given up for one reason or another. But just before Charles died England and Holland had induced Louis XIV to agree that the Archduke Charles should have Spain, the Netherlands, and the colonies, on condition that the Bourbons should receive the Spanish holdings in Italy with the prospect of exchanging Milan for Lorraine. The Emperor, however, stubbornly refused to ratify this partition. Moreover Louis was only temporizing when he acceded to this division, for his clever agents had been busy all along at the Spanish court trying to induce the dying king to maintain the integrity of the Spanish possessions and turn them all over to his French relatives.

Will of Charles II of Spain

In this they succeeded, for when finally the long-expected death of the Spanish king occurred (November, 1700) it was found that he had left a will in which he desired that his twenty-two crowns should fall to the duke of Anjou on condition, however, that the crowns of France and Spain should never rest upon the same head. Should the Bourbons refuse to accept the bequest, the inheritance was to be passed on to the Archduke Charles of Austria, that hereditary enemy of France.

Should Louis XIV accept the heritage for his grandson?

It was a crucial moment in the history of Europe when the news of Charles's will reached Louis XIV. By the provisions of the Partition Treaty, he had renounced on the part of his family all claims to the Spanish dominions. He clearly foresaw that war was likely to follow his acceptance and well knew that France was already terribly exhausted by his previous enterprises. Nevertheless the prize was tempting beyond measure. He had been secretly working for it for years, and his refusal meant its transfer to a hated rival. To say "no" meant that, as Torcy, the head of French foreign affairs, urged: "The same courier who has been dispatched to convey the news of the will to France will proceed to Vienna; and the Spanish nation, without hesitation, will acknowledge the Emperor's second son as their king. The house of Austria will then unite between father and son the power of Charles V, a power hitherto so fatal to France." Such arguments could not but appeal strongly to the king.

Louis decides to accept the will of Charles II

For a brief time Louis XIV hesitated, either to save appearances or because he realized fully the gravity of the situation; but at last he decided to accept the privilege for his grandson, and on November 16, 1700, he called the Spanish ambassador to his private chamber and told him to salute the duke of Anjou as the king of Spain. Louis then threw open the folding doors of his cabinet, bade the courtiers enter, and, with the majestic air of which he was the consummate master, he said, "Gentlemen, permit me to present to you the king of Spain. His station called him to that crown; the late king has called him to it by his will; and the whole nation has fixed its desire upon him and has eagerly asked me for him. It is the will of Heaven; I have obeyed it with pleasure." Then turning to his grandson, he said, "Be a good Spaniard; that is your first duty; but remember that you are a Frenchman born, in order that in this way the union between the two nations may be preserved. By this means you will be able to render both peoples happy and preserve the peace of

Europe." The leading French journal of the time boldly proclaimed that the Pyrenees were no more.[1]

Louis's indiscreet conduct hastens the outbreak of war

Contrary to expectations, Louis's conduct in accepting the throne of Spain for a member of his family failed to arouse general indignation. Both England and the United Provinces concurred in the new arrangement as inevitable, and even acknowledged the duke of Anjou as king of Spain under the title of Philip V. It looked as if Louis were going to have everything his own way; and had he been more discreet he might have secured his prize without war. However, the commercial issue quickly became prominent, for he soon published a series of decrees relating to the Spanish-American trade which clearly indicated that the English and Dutch could expect no favors. He sent French soldiers to reënforce the Spanish troops in the barrier fortresses of the Spanish Netherlands and began to build ships at Cadiz as if Spain were now a part of France. Moveover he had his courts declare solemnly that his grandson, Philip, still retained his rights to the French crown. Finally, in 1701, upon the death of the exiled king, James II, Louis, contrary to the promise he had made in the Treaty of Ryswick, recognized the deposed king's son as sovereign of England.

William III forms the Grand Alliance

Louis could hardly have discovered more effective methods of irritating and alarming the English and the Dutch. They were now thoroughly aroused, and William easily succeeded in forming a Grand Alliance in which Louis's old enemies, England, Holland, the Emperor, and the king of Prussia, were the important members. The allies reviewed the various examples of Louis's arrogance and his dangerous encroachments upon his neighbors. They proposed to unite in order to wrest his newly acquired advantages from him, restore to the Dutch their barrier towns, win the Italian possessions of Spain for the Emperor, and perhaps the West Indies for England.

[1] For extracts illustrating this matter of the Spanish will, see *Readings*, sect. 9.

Death of William III, 1702

William himself died (1702) just as hostilities were beginning, and so the Alliance against Louis lost its great leader. William was succeeded by his sister-in-law, Anne, who was not distinguished for her capacity as a ruler. The English were, however, pledged to the Alliance and deeply interested in it.

General course of the war

Accordingly the long War of the Spanish Succession was carried on vigorously by the English general, the duke of Marlborough, as well as by the Austrian commander, Eugene of Savoy. Louis, on the contrary, no longer had generals like Condé and Turenne, who had gained the victories in his earlier wars. All the important battles, Blenheim, Ramillies, and Oudenarde, went against him. The conflict was more general than the Thirty Years' War had been; even in America there was fighting between the French and English colonists which passes in American histories under the name of Queen Anne's War. In the unequal conflict France was rapidly being ruined by the destruction of her people and her wealth; after some ten years of war, Louis was willing to consider a compromise that would bring peace. But as the allies were constantly quarreling among themselves, charging one another with failure to render the promised help in the war, Louis was able to save something from the wreck in the treaties which, after twelve years of fighting in the Netherlands, Germany, Spain, and Italy, established peace once more.

Peace of Utrecht, 1713

Treaty of Utrecht

10. The Peace of Utrecht[1] changed the map of Europe as no previous treaty had done, not even that of Westphalia which closed the Thirty Years' War in 1648. Each of the

[1] The greater part of the powers which had been involved in the War of the Spanish Succession concluded peace with one another at Utrecht, April, 1713; but the Emperor did not sign his treaty with France until the following March at Rastadt. This was accepted by the representatives of the Holy Roman Empire a few months later at Baden in Switzerland. So, to be quite accurate, one should speak of the Peace of Utrecht-Rastadt-Baden, 1713–1714.

EUROPE
after the Treaties of
UTRECHT AND RASTADT,
1713-1714.
Boundary of the Empire
Scale of Miles
KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
Scotland
Ireland
England
London
ATLANTIC OCEAN
North Sea
KINGDOM OF DENMARK & NORWAY
KINGDOM OF SWEDEN
Baltic Sea
Prussia
POLAND
THE EMPIRE
Saxony
Silesia
Bohemia
Moravia
Bavaria
Austria
Kingdom of Hungary
Transylvania
KINGDOM OF FRANCE
Paris
Versailles
Republic of Venice
OTTOMAN DOMINIONS
KINGDOM OF PORTUGAL
KINGDOM OF SPAIN
Madrid
Lisbon
Seville
Majorca
Minorca
Ivica
Sardinia
Corsica
Naples
Sicily
Palermo
Messina
Malta
Candia
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
AFRICA
Longitude West
Longitude East

combatants got a share of the Spanish booty over which they had been struggling. The Bourbon Philip was permitted to retain the crown of Spain and all her colonies, but the Spanish and French crowns were never to rest on the same head. Though losing the Spanish Netherlands and the Italian possessions, Spain was really benefited by this arrangement, for, under the new sovereign, attention could be given to those domestic and administrative reforms so long and so sadly needed.

Extent of Philip V's possessions

The Archduke Charles, now become Emperor after the death of his brother, was of course obliged to surrender his hopes of becoming king of Spain; but his disappointment was solaced by considerable additions to the Austrian realms. He was awarded the Spanish Netherlands, which were to continue to form a barrier between the Dutch and the French. He also received most of the Spanish possessions in Italy; namely, Naples, Milan, and the island of Sardinia. In this way it came about that Austria got that hold upon Italy which was not relinquished until 1866.

Austria receives the Spanish Netherlands and portions of Italy

Of all the countries which participated in the War of the Spanish Succession, England came out with the most considerable and permanent gains. In the first place, the question of the succession to the English crown was set at rest. Louis XIV had always shown himself ready to forward a revolution in England in order to replace a Catholic king upon the throne. But he now agreed to recognize Anne as the legitimate ruler and promised never, either openly or by fomenting sedition, to attack her or her Protestant successors as designated by Parliament.

England's gains

In America, England acquired from France Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and the Hudson Bay region, all of which she still holds. In this way the gradual expulsion of the French from North America began. From Spain England received the rock of Gibraltar from which she still commands the narrow entrance to the Mediterranean Sea, now doubly important

England receives the French lands in America

Gibraltar

since the establishment of the British Empire in India and the opening of the Suez Canal. She also induced Spain to bind herself not to grant to France or any other nation the right to trade freely with her colonies, but secured for herself the highly-prized privilege of supplying the Spanish colonies with African slaves for thirty years. She was also permitted to send each year to Porto Bello, on the isthmus of Panama, a ship of five hundred tons' burden laden with merchandise, — a concession which only served to encourage smuggling on a larger scale than ever before and led finally to a war between the two countries.

Dreary nature of political history after the Peace of Utrecht

The political history during the twenty-five years following the conclusion of the Peace of Utrecht is particularly dreary and unprofitable; we may therefore neglect it altogether and merely explain here the principal changes, especially those in the map of Italy, which were made during that period.

The Emperor Charles VI and Philip V of Spain reach an agreement in 1720

The Peace of Utrecht had not reconciled the two monarchs chiefly concerned in the War of the Spanish Succession, namely, the new Bourbon king of Spain, Philip V, and the Emperor, Charles VI. The Emperor still refused to recognize Philip as king of Spain, while Philip, on his part, was reluctant to acknowledge the loss of Spain's possessions in Italy, which, according to the treaties, were to fall to Austria. Philip V, moreover, had married an enterprising Italian princess, Elizabeth of Parma, who soon set her heart upon securing some kind of a respectable principality in Italy for their little son, Don Carlos. Under her influence, Spain tried in 1717–1718 to regain Sardinia and Sicily by arms, but was forced by France and England to agree to a peace in 1720 in which Parma and Tuscany were promised to Don Carlos as soon as their rulers, who were without heirs, should die. The Emperor at last acknowledged Philip as king of Spain, but only on condition that he should be given Sicily, which was taken from the duke of Savoy who had to content himself with the island of Sardinia and the title of king.

The duke of Savoy becomes king of Sardinia. (1720)

War of the Polish Succession (1733–1735)

Austria and Spain, however, were not satisfied to leave Italy alone and before long found an excuse for renewed fighting and another readjustment. Louis XV of France, who succeeded his great-grandfather Louis XIV in 1715, had married the daughter of Stanislas Lesczcynski, a deposed king of Poland, whom he felt it his duty to attempt to restore to his throne. An opportunity offered itself in 1733, and France was forced to go to war in the interest of her king's father-in-law. Spain sided with Stanislas, Austria supported his rival; but it was Italy, not Poland, in which both were really interested.

The Spanish Bourbons established in southern Italy

After two years of hostilities and three years of negotiations, a new agreement was made at Vienna in 1738. The Emperor, who had been badly beaten, agreed to turn over Naples and Sicily to Don Carlos on condition that the latter should give up all claim to Parma and Tuscany. In this way the queen of Spain secured the coveted kingdom of the Two Sicilies [1] for her son and his heirs. This younger branch of the Spanish Bourbons held all southern Italy until the last of them was driven out by Garibaldi in 1860.

How France got Lorraine (1766) and Tuscany fell to Austria

As Louis XV had not succeeded in replacing his father-in-law on the Polish throne, he looked about for a dukedom to solace the ex-king's declining years. Since there was none vacant, the duke of Lorraine was induced to surrender his patrimony to Stanislas Lesczcynski, after whose death (which occurred in 1766) France was to be allowed to annex this long-coveted region. In view of this advantageous arrangement, France gave her consent to a marriage between Francis, the dispossessed duke of Lorraine, and the Emperor's daughter, Maria Theresa, of whom we shall hear more anon. As an indemnity for the loss of his duchy, Francis was given Tuscany with its famous city of Florence. This had long been under the rule of the Medici, but the line died out in 1737 and their lands thus passed to a stranger from across the Alps.

The end of the Medici

[1] This singular name owes its origin to the fact that during the Middle Ages the kingdom of Naples was commonly called "Sicily" as well as the island of Sicily.

The disruption of Italy in the eighteenth century

Italy's fate was sealed for more than a century. As we glance at the map (in 1750), we find a Spanish ruler once more controlling, as of old, all the southern portions of the peninsula. Another foreign power, Austria, holds Milan and indirectly Tuscany. (Parma she agreed in 1748 to hand over to a younger son of the queen of Spain.) Across the peninsula, between the Austrian and the Spanish lands, lay the Papal States, which for hundreds of years had belonged to the head of the Roman Catholic Church. The two ancient republics, Venice and Genoa, once the glory of Italy, had lost a great part of their former importance, nor were the two little independent duchies of Modena and Lucca in a position to resist foreign interference.

The king of Sardinia and his later importance

As later history showed, the hope of Italy lay in the king of Sardinia, whose capital was Turin. His realms consisted of Piedmont and the mountainous Savoy together with the unimportant island from which he derived the royal title that he was destined one day to exchange for the far more glorious one of King of Italy. We shall later describe the extraordinary series of events in the nineteenth century which enabled Italy to free herself from the control of foreign nations which had so long and so impudently disposed of her possessions and which permitted her, after many vicissitudes, to unite all her scattered members into a firm national union.

Holy Roman Empire unaffected by the Peace of Utrecht

The Peace of Utrecht did not affect the Holy Roman Empire, which remained for almost another century the same loose union of practically independent dukedoms, principalities, bishoprics, and towns that it had long been. The new kingdom of Prussia was, however, preparing to assume an important place in European affairs.

Death of Louis XIV and accession of Louis XV (1715)

When Louis XIV had died in 1715, after a reign of more than seventy years, France experienced a feeling of relief. There was no one to spoil the general satisfaction by foretelling that the new king, then but five years old, was beginning a long and inglorious reign during which he would exhibit a love of

THE ITALIAN STATES
IN 1750
Under Spanish Bourbons
Under the House of Austria
Papal States
Remaining Italian States
SWITZERLAND
FRANCE
AUSTRIAN DOMAINS
SAVOY
KINGDOM OF SARDINIA
Turin
PIEDMONT
Milan
MILAN
REP. OF VENICE
Venice
PARMA
MODENA
GENOA
Lucca
Florence
TUSCANY
PAPAL STATES
DALMATIA
I. CORSICA
(To Genoa)
Rome
Naples
KINGDOM
OF THE
TWO SICILIES
SARDINIA
Palermo
SICILY
AFRICA
10°
15°
45°
40°
35°
0 50 100 200
Scale of Miles

low debauchery and a cruel indifference to the public welfare quite alien to his great-grandfather, whose death was mistaken as a harbinger of better times to come. France was greatly exhausted by many wars, and under Louis XV her military power ceased to be a terror to her neighbors.

France declines as a military power but becomes the teacher of Europe

But even if her king was incompetent, her generals inferior, and her campaigns resulted in shameful defeats; though she lost her colonies and was weighed down by bad taxes and the survivals of feudal dues and privileges, France nevertheless became under Louis XV the leader of European thought and the teacher of the nations. Her scientists, philosophers, and economists, as we shall see, pointed the way toward progress by denouncing the old abuses and errors — sometimes too hotly, it is true, but in such a manner that no one could refuse to listen to them. At last, in the Revolution of 1789, France gave Europe an example of thorough-going reform which was sooner or later followed by all the western powers.

England lays the foundation of her commercial greatness in the eighteenth century

England had gained much in the settlement at Utrecht[1] and was able to overshadow France as a naval and colonial power. Indeed at the end of the War of the Spanish Succession her navy was the finest in the world, since both of her chief rivals, the Dutch and the French, had been decidedly weakened in the conflict. For a quarter of a century after the close of the war England managed to keep out of the conflicts on the continent,[2] but later she felt obliged to intervene, as

[1] During the War of the Spanish Succession, England had strengthened herself by a final union with Scotland. For centuries the difficulties between the two countries had led to much bloodshed and suffering. In 1603, on the accession to the English throne of the Scotch king, James VI, as James I of England, the two countries had come under the same ruler, but each had maintained its own independent parliament and system of government. Finally, in 1707, both countries agreed to unite in one government. Forty-five members of the British House of Commons were thereafter to be chosen in Scotland, and sixteen Scotch lords were added to the British House of Lords. In this way the whole island of Great Britain was at last placed under a single government, and the occasions for strife and misunderstanding thereby greatly reduced.

[2] Except when, in 1718–1720, England allied herself with France against Spain, and her admiral, Byng, destroyed the Spanish fleet.

Intervenes in continental wars with a view of maintaining "balance of power"

we shall see, in order to maintain "the balance of power" among her neighbors across the channel. Her great wars, however, were waged in distant parts of the world and on sea more often than on land. Fifty years after the Peace of Utrecht, England succeeded in driving the French from both India and North America [1] and laid the foundation of that vast colonial empire which gives her the commercial supremacy among European nations to-day.

The accession of the Hanoverian line to the English throne

In order to make the later history clear, it is necessary to notice here a remarkable change in the English line of kings. None of Queen Anne's children survived her, and she was succeeded, according to an arrangement made before her accession, by the nearest Protestant heir. This was George I, son of James I's granddaughter, Sophia.[2] She had married the elector of Hanover [3]; consequently the king who came to the English throne in 1714 was a German, and as elector of Hanover his continental realms belonged to the Holy Roman Empire.

[1] See below, Chapters VI–VII.


[2] James I (1603–1625)
Charles I (1625–1649)
Elizabeth, m. Frederick V, elector of the Palatinate (Winter King of Bohemia)
Charles II (1660–1684)
(1) Anne Hyde, m. James II (1685–1689), m. (2) Mary of Modena
Sophia, m. Ernest Augustus, elector of Hanover
William III, m. Mary (1689–1702) (1689–1694)
Anne (1702–1714)
George I (1714–1727)
James Francis Edward (the Old Pretender, 1688–1766)
George II (1727–1760)
Charles Edward (the Young Pretender)
Frederick, prince of Wales (d. 1751)
George III (1760–1820)

[3] Originally there had been but seven electors (see above, p. 24), but the duke of Bavaria had been made an elector during the Thirty Years' War, and in 1692 the father of George I had been permitted to assume the title of Elector of Hanover.

Hanover and England were not united

This circumstance did not cause as much trouble as might have been expected. There was no question of uniting Hanover and Great Britain in any way. Indeed, England assumed no responsibility for her king's German territory. Nevertheless the policy of the Hanoverian kings was from time to time influenced by attacks made upon their electorate. The inability of George I to speak English led to an important result, since he was compelled to turn over most of the business of government to his ministers and, as will be shown later, this led to the development of the famous English cabinet.

REFERENCES

Attempts to Settle Claims to the Spanish Throne: WAKEMAN, *European History, 1598–1715*, pp. 312–330; TRAILL, *William III*, pp. 156–170; PERKINS, *France under the Regency*, pp. 239–251; KITCHIN, *History of France*, Vol. III, pp. 277–287.

The Spanish Will and Louis XIV: WAKEMAN, pp. 330–340; TRAILL, pp. 187–195; PERKINS, pp. 253–271; KITCHIN, Vol. III, pp. 287–291.

Marlborough and the War of the Spanish Succession: WAKEMAN, pp. 345–365; GREEN, *Short History of the English People*, chap. ix, pp. 705–720; PERKINS, pp. 273–285; KITCHIN, Vol. III, pp. 296–330.

Europe at the Peace of Utrecht: WAKEMAN, pp. 366–373; HASSALL, *European History, 1715–1789*, pp. 1–24; PERKINS, pp. 285–290; KITCHIN, Vol. III, pp. 330–342.

The Union of England and Scotland: GREEN, chap. ix, sect. 9, pp. 714–715; COLBY, *Selections from the Sources of English History*, pp. 227–229; LEE, *Source Book of English History*, pp. 443–445.

The Closing Years of Louis XIV's Reign: PERKINS, pp. 293–323; KITCHIN, Vol. III, pp. 343–359.

CHAPTER IV

RUSSIA AND PRUSSIA BECOME EUROPEAN POWERS

PETER THE GREAT PLANS TO MAKE RUSSIA A EUROPEAN POWER

11. Hitherto our attention has been fixed upon western and southern Europe. We have reviewed the chief events of Louis XIV's reign, his theory of kingship, his warlike policy, and have briefly introduced the several actors in the successive struggles, — England, Spain, the Netherlands, the Holy Roman Empire, and the Italian states. We must now turn from the Rhine and the Pyrenees to the shores of the Baltic and the vast plains of Russia; for while the War of the Spanish Succession was in progress another conflict was raging in the North, and changes were taking place there comparable in importance to those which were ratified by the Peace of Utrecht. Russia, which had hitherto faced eastward, was turning toward the West, upon which she was destined to exert an ever-increasing influence. The newly founded kingdom of Prussia was gathering its forces for a series of brilliant military exploits under the leadership of Frederick the Great, one of the most celebrated rulers of all times.

The Slavic peoples of Europe and the extent of Russia

There has been no occasion in dealing with the situation in western Europe to speak heretofore of the Slavic peoples to which the Russians, as well as the Poles, Bohemians, Bulgarians, and other nations of eastern Europe belong, although together they constitute the most numerous race in Europe. Not until the opening of the eighteenth century did Russia begin to take an active part in western affairs. Now she is one of the most important factors in the politics of the world. Of the realms of the Tsar, that portion which lies in Euro-

exceeds in extent the territories of all the other rulers of the continent put together, and yet European Russia comprises scarcely a quarter of the Tsar's whole dominion, which embraces northern and central Asia, extends to the Pacific Ocean, and forms altogether an empire covering about three times the area of the United States.

Beginnings of Russia

The beginnings of the Russian state fall in the ninth century; some of the Northmen invaded the districts to the east of the Baltic, while their relatives were causing grievous trouble in France and England. It is generally supposed that one of their leaders, Rurik, was the first to consolidate the Slavic tribes about Novgorod into a sort of state in 862. Rurik's successor extended the bounds of the new empire so as to include the important town of Kiev on the Dnieper. The word "Russia" is probably derived from *Rous*, the name given by the neighboring Finns to the Norman adventurers. Before the end of the tenth century the Greek form of Christianity was introduced and the Russian ruler was baptized. The frequent intercourse with Constantinople might have led to rapid advance in civilization had it not been for a great disaster which put Russia back for centuries.

The Tartar invasion in the thirteenth century

Russia is geographically nothing more than an extension of the vast plain of northern Asia, which the Russians were destined finally to conquer. It was therefore exposed to the great invasion of the Tartars, or Mongols, who swept in from the East in the thirteenth century. The powerful Tartar ruler, Genghis Khan (1162–1227), conquered northern China and central Asia, and the mounted hordes of his successors crossed into Europe and overran Russia, which had fallen apart into numerous principalities. The Russian princes became the dependents of the great Khan, and had frequently to seek his far-distant court, some three thousand miles away, where he freely disposed of both their crowns and their heads. The Tartars exacted tribute of the Russians, but left them undisturbed in their laws and religion.

Influence of the Tartar occupation on manners and customs

Of the Russian princes who went to prostrate themselves at the foot of the Great Khan's throne, none made a more favorable impression upon him than the prince of Moscow, in whose favor the Khan was wont to decide all cases of dispute between the prince and his rivals. When the Mongol power had begun to decline in strength and the princes of Moscow had grown stronger, they ventured, in 1480, to kill the Mongol ambassadors sent to demand tribute, and thus freed themselves from the Mongol yoke. But the Tartar occupation had left its mark, for the princes of Moscow imitated the Khans rather than the western rulers, of whom, in fact, they knew nothing. In 1547 Ivan the Terrible assumed the Asiatic title of Tsar,[1] which appeared to him more worthy than that of king or emperor. The costumes and etiquette of the court were also Asiatic. The Russian armor suggested that of the Chinese, and their headdress was a turban. It was the task of Peter the Great to Europeanize Russia.

Ivan the Terrible assumes the title of Tsar

Peter the Great (1672–1725)

At the time of Peter's accession, Russia, which had grown greatly under Ivan the Terrible and other enterprising rulers, still had no outlet to the sea. In manners and customs the kingdom was Asiatic, and its government was that of a Tartar prince. Peter had no quarrel with the despotic power which fell to him and which the Russian monarchs still exercise.[2] But he knew that Russia was very much behind the rest of Europe, and that his crudely equipped soldiers could never make head against the well-armed and disciplined troops of the West. He had no seaport and no ships, without which Russia could never hope to take part in the world's affairs. His two great tasks were, therefore, to introduce western habits and to "make a window," as he expressed it, through which Russia might look abroad.

[1] The title Tsar, or Czar, was formerly supposed to be connected with Cæsar (German *Kaiser*), i.e. emperor, but this appears to have been a mistake.

[2] At the time of writing (summer, 1907) it is impossible to foretell how long the latter part of this statement will continue to be true. The Russian revolution now in progress will be described below. See chap. xxviii.

NOTE: The boundaries of the various powers are of the year of accession of Peter the Great
NORTHEASTERN EUROPE in the time of PETER THE GREAT
0 50 100 200 300 400
SCALE OF MILES
Territory added to Russia by Peter the Great
KINGDOM OF NORWAY
SWEDEN
FINLAND
KINGDOM OF DENMARK
KINGDOM OF SCOTLAND
KINGDOM OF ENGLAND
NORTH SEA
BALTIC SEA
Gulf of Bothnia
Gulf of Finland
White Sea
Archangel
Lake Onega
Lake Ladoga
St. Petersburg
Stockholm
Christiania
Copenhagen
Berlin
Paris
Vienna
Budapest
Warsaw
Moscow
RUSSIA
KINGDOM OF POLAND
Lithuania
Courland
ESTHONIA
INGRIA
LIVONIA
Novgorod
Pskov
Smolensk
Ryazan
Tver
Nizhni Novgorod
Kasan
Vyatka
Perm
Veronesh
Saratov
Uralsk (Taik)
Kiev
Pultowa
Cherkask
Astrakhan
Stavropol
Crimea
Azov
CASPIAN SEA
BLACK SEA
TURKISH DOMINIONS
Transylvania
Wallachia
Bucharest
Belgrade
Bender
Podolia
Volga
Don
Dnieper
Danube
Vistula
Oder
Elbe
Rhine
Longitude 10° East from 15° Greenwich 20°
THE MATTHEWS-NORTHRUP WORKS

Peter's travels in Europe

In 1697–1698, when the western powers were enjoying the peace concluded at Ryswick, Peter himself visited Germany, Holland, and England, with a view to investigating every art and science of the West, as well as the most approved methods of manufacture, from the making of a man-of-war to the etching of an engraving. Nothing escaped the keen eyes of this rude, half-savage northern giant. For a week he put on the wide breeches of a Dutch laborer and worked in the shipyard at Saardam near Amsterdam. In England, Holland, and Germany he engaged artisans, scientific men, architects, ship captains, and those versed in artillery and the training of troops, all of whom he took back with him to aid in the reform and development of Russia.

Suppression of revolt against foreign ideas

He was called home by the revolt of the royal guard, who had allied themselves with the very large party of nobles and churchmen who were horrified at Peter's desertion of the habits and customs of his forefathers. They hated what they called "German ideas," such as short coats, tobacco smoking, and beardless faces. The clergy even suggested that Peter was perhaps Antichrist. Peter took a fearful revenge upon the rebels, and is said to have himself cut off the heads of many of them.

Peter's reform measures

Peter's reforms extended through his whole reign. He made his people give up their cherished oriental beards and long flowing garments. He forced the women of the better class, who had been kept in a sort of oriental harem, to come out and meet the men in social assemblies, such as were common in the West. He invited foreigners to settle in Russia, and insured them protection, privileges, and the free exercise of their religion. He sent young Russians abroad to study. He reorganized the government officials on the model of a western kingdom, and made over his army in the same way.[1]

Finding that the old capital of Moscow clung persistently to its ancient habits, he prepared to found a new capital for

[1] See *Readings*, sect. II.

Founding of a new capital, St. Petersburg

his new Russia. He selected for this purpose a bit of territory on the Baltic which he had conquered from Sweden, — very marshy, it is true, but where he might hope to construct Russia's first real port. Here he built St. Petersburg at enormous expense and colonized it with Russians and foreigners.

The military prowess of Charles XII of Sweden

In his ambition to get to the sea, Peter naturally collided with Sweden, to which the provinces between Russia and the Baltic belonged. Never had Sweden, or any other country, had a more warlike king than the one with whom Peter had to contend, — the youthful prodigy, Charles XII. When Charles came to the throne in 1697 he was only fifteen years old, and it seemed to the natural enemies of Sweden an auspicious time to profit by the supposed weakness of the boy ruler. So a union was formed between Denmark, Poland, and Russia, with the object of increasing their territories at Sweden's expense. But Charles turned out to be a second Alexander the Great in military prowess. He astonished Europe by promptly besieging Copenhagen and forcing the king of Denmark to sign a treaty of peace. He then turned like lightning against Peter, who was industriously besieging Narva, and with eight thousand Swedes wiped out an army of fifty thousand Russians (1700). Lastly he defeated the king of Poland.

Defeat and death of Charles XII

Though Charles was a remarkable military leader, he was a foolish ruler. He undertook to wrest Poland from its king, to whom he attributed the formation of the league against him. He had a new king crowned at Warsaw, whom he at last succeeded in getting recognized. He then turned his attention to Peter, who had meanwhile been conquering the Baltic provinces. This time fortune turned against the Swedes. The long march to Moscow proved as fatal to them as to Napoleon a century later, Charles XII being totally defeated in the battle of Pultowa (1709). He fled to Turkey, where he spent some years in vainly urging the Sultan to attack Peter. Returning at last to his own kingdom, which he had utterly neglected for years, he was killed in 1718 while besieging a town.

Soon after Charles's death a treaty was concluded between Sweden and Russia by which Russia gained Livonia, Esthonia, and the other Swedish provinces at the eastern end of the Baltic. Peter had made less successful attempts to get a footing on the Black Sea. He had first taken Azof, which he soon lost during the war with Sweden, and then several towns on the Caspian. It had become evident that if the Turks should be driven out of Europe, Russia would be a mighty rival of the western powers in the division of the spoils.

Russia acquires the Baltic provinces and attempts to get a footing on the Black Sea

For a generation after the death of Peter the Great, Russia fell into the hands of incompetent rulers. It appears again as a European state when the great Catharine II came to the throne in 1762. From that time on, the western powers had always to consider the vast Slavic empire in all their great struggles. They had also to consider a new kingdom in northern Germany, Prussia, which was just growing into a great power as Peter began his work.

Rise of Prussia

12. The electorate of Brandenburg had figured on the map of Europe for centuries, and there was no particular reason to suppose that it was one day to become the dominant state in Germany. Early in the fifteenth century the old line of electors had died out, and the impecunious Emperor Sigismund had sold it to a hitherto inconspicuous house, the Hohenzollerns, who are known to us now through such names as those of Frederick the Great, William I, the first German emperor, and his grandson, the present emperor. While it has always been the pride of the Hohenzollern family that practically every one of its reigning members has added something to what his ancestors handed down to him, nothing need be said of the little earlier annexations; no great extension took place until 1614, when the elector of Brandenburg inherited Cleves and Mark, and thus got his first hold on the Rhine district.

The House of Hohenzollern

Prussia acquired by the elector of Brandenburg

What was quite as important, he won, four years later, far to the east, the duchy of Prussia, which was separated from Brandenburg by Polish territory. Prussia was originally the name of a region on the Baltic inhabited by heathen Slavs. These had been conquered in the thirteenth century by one of the orders of crusading knights, who, when the conquest of the Holy Land was abandoned, looked about for other occupations. The region filled up with German colonists, but it came under the sovereignty of the neighboring kingdom of Poland, whose ruler annexed the western half of the territory of the Teutonic Order, as the German knights were called. In Luther's day (1525) the knights accepted Protestantism and dissolved their order. They then formed their lands into the duchy of Prussia and made their Grand Master, who was a relative of the elector of Brandenburg, their first duke, under the suzerainty of the king of Poland. About a hundred years later (1618) this branch of the Hohenzollerns died out, and the duchy then fell to the elector of Brandenburg.

The territories of the Great Elector (1640–1688)

Notwithstanding this substantial territorial gain, there was little promise that the hitherto obscure electorate would ever become a formidable power when, in 1640, Frederick William, known as the Great Elector, came to his inheritance. His territories were scattered from the Rhine to the Vistula, his army was of small account, and his authority disputed by powerful nobles and local assemblies. The center of his domain was Brandenburg. Far to the west was Mark, bordering on the Rhine valley, and Cleves lying on both banks of that river. Far to the east, beyond the Vistula, was the duchy of Prussia, outside the borders of the Empire and subject to the overlordship of the king of Poland.

Character of the Great Elector

Frederick William was, however, well fitted for the task of welding these domains into a powerful state. He was coarse by nature, heartless in destroying opponents, treacherous in diplomatic negotiations, and entirely devoid of the culture which distinguished Louis XIV and his court. He set resolutely

to work to build up a great army, destroy the local assemblies in his provinces, place all government in the hands of his officials, and add new territories to his patrimony.

The Great Elector makes important gains in territory

In all of these undertakings he was largely successful. By shrewd tactics during the closing days of the Thirty Years' War he managed to secure, by the treaties of Westphalia, the bishoprics of Minden and Halberstadt and the duchy of Farther

Territories of the Great Elector of Brandenburg

Pomerania, which gave him a good shore line on the Baltic. He also forced Poland to surrender her overlordship of the duchy of Prussia and thus made himself a duke independent of the Empire.

Reforms of the Great Elector

Knowing that the interests of his house depended on military strength, he organized, in spite of the protests of the taxpayers, an army out of all proportion to the size and wealth of his dominions. He reformed the system of administration and succeeded in creating an absolute monarchy on the model furnished by his contemporary, Louis XIV. He joined England and Holland in their alliances against Louis, and the army of Brandenburg began to be known and feared.

Huguenots received in Brandenburg

Though a good Protestant, the Great Elector permitted religious freedom to a remarkable degree. He made Catholics eligible to office and, on the other hand, gave asylum to the

persecuted Huguenots of France, even offering them special inducements to settle in his realms. In short, as his illustrious descendant, Frederick the Great, wrote: "He was the restorer and defender of Brandenburg, and an arbiter among his equals. With slight means he did great things; he was his own prime minister and commander-in-chief and rendered flourishing a state which he found buried beneath its own ruins."

Brandenburg becomes the kingdom of Prussia, 1701

It was accordingly a splendid legacy which the Great Elector left in 1688 to his son, Frederick III, and although the career of the latter was by no means as brilliant as that of his father, he was able by a bold stroke to transform his electorate into a kingdom. The opportunity for this achievement was offered by the need of the powers for his assistance against the designs of Louis XIV. When the Emperor called upon Frederick III in 1700 to assist him in securing a division of the Spanish dominions, the elector exacted as the price of his help the recognition of his right to take the title of king.

Frederick III, elector of Brandenburg, becomes King Frederick I of Prussia

The title King of Prussia was deemed preferable to the more natural King of Brandenburg because Prussia lay wholly without the bounds of the Empire and consequently its ruler was not in any sense subject to the Emperor but was entirely independent. Since West Prussia still belonged to Poland in 1701, the new king satisfied himself at first with the title King *in* Prussia.

Government of Frederick William I (1713–1740)

The second ruler of the new kingdom, Frederick William I, the father of Frederick the Great, is known to history as the rough and boorish barrack king who devoted himself entirely to governing his realm, collecting tall soldiers, drilling his battalions, hunting wild game, and smoking strong tobacco. He ruled his family and his country with an iron hand, declaring to those who remonstrated, "Salvation belongs to the Lord; everything else is my business."

Frederick William and his soldiers

Frederick William was passionately fond of military life from his childhood. He took special pride in stalwart soldiers and collected them at great expense from all parts of Europe. He raised the army, which numbered twenty-seven thousand

in the days of the Great Elector, to eighty-four thousand, making it almost equal to that maintained by France or Austria. He reserved to himself the right to appoint subordinates as well as high officials in the service and based promotion on excellence in discipline rather than on family connections. He was constantly drilling and reviewing his men, whom he addressed affectionately as "my blue children."

Miserly economy in finances

Moreover, by wise management, miserly thrift, and entire indifference to the amenities of life, Frederick William treasured up a large sum of money. He discharged a large number of court servants; sold at auction many of the royal jewels; and had a great portion of the family plate coined into money. Consequently he was able to leave to his son, Frederick II, not only an admirable army but an ample supply of gold. Indeed it was his toil and economy that made possible the achievements of his far more distinguished son.

REFERENCES

Russia under Peter the Great: WAKEMAN, *European History, 1598–1715*, pp. 298–304; RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, Vol. II, pp. 76–105.

Peter the Great and Charles XII: WAKEMAN, pp. 304–311; HASSALL, *European History, 1715–1789*, pp. 57–62; RAMBAUD, Vol. II, pp. 51–75; BAIN, *Charles XII and the Collapse of the Swedish Empire* (Heroes of the Nations Series).

Peter the Great's European Journeys: RAMBAUD, Vol. II, pp. 33–39, 112–118.

Brandenburg and the Great Elector: WAKEMAN, pp. 173–181, 292–297; HENDERSON, *Short History of Germany*, Vol. II, pp. 9–29; CARLYLE, *Frederick the Great*, Vol. I, Book III, chap. xviii; TUTTLE, *History of Prussia to the Accession of Frederick the Great*, pp. 208–250.

Frederick William, the Father of Frederick the Great: TUTTLE, pp. 337–487; HENDERSON, Vol. II, pp. 87–111; CARLYLE, Vol. I, Book IV, chaps. iii and iv.

CHAPTER V

THE WARS OF FREDERICK THE GREAT

FREDERICK THE GREAT AND MARIA THERESA

Frederick's literary tastes, and troubles with his father

13. It was reserved for Frederick II of Prussia to stir Europe to its depths, to win for his little kingdom a place among the European powers, and to earn for himself the title of "the Great." As a youth he had grieved and disgusted his father by his fondness for books and his passion for writing verses and playing the flute. A French tutor had instilled in him a love for the polished language of France and an enthusiasm for her literature and for her philosophers who were busy attacking the traditional religious ideas to which Frederick's father stoutly clung. When eighteen years old Frederick had tried to run away in order to escape the harsh military discipline to which he was subjected. He was captured and brought before the king, who was in such a rage that he seemed upon the point of killing his renegade son with his sword. He contented himself, however, with imprisoning Frederick in the citadel of Küstrin, with no books except a Bible, and forced him to witness the execution of one of his companions, who had aided his flight.

After this Frederick consented to give some contemptuous attention to public affairs. He inspected the royal domains near Küstrin and began, for the first time, to study the peasants, their farms, and their cattle. He even agreed to marry a princess whom his father had selected for him, and settled down to a scholarly life, studying literature, philosophy, history, and mathematics, and carrying on a correspondence with learned men of all nations, especially with Voltaire,[1] whom he greatly

[1] See below, p. 168.

admired. He was very fond indeed of writing himself and seized every spare moment of a busy life to push forward his works upon history, politics, and military matters. No less than twenty-four volumes of his writings, all in French, were published shortly after his death, and these did not include everything that he had managed to write.

Frederick begins to attend to business

Frederick did not neglect to give some attention to the duties which were to devolve upon him when he should become king. He accompanied the Prussian contingent which took part in the War of the Polish Succession (1733–1735)[1] and noted certain weaknesses in the Austrian army, with which he was soon to engage. He took occasion to maneuver a regiment before his father and showed such skill that Frederick William conceded that literature had not completely demoralized his son after all.

Accession of Frederick II, 1740

Frederick had no trouble, when the time came, in showing the world that he was one of the greatest generals of all the ages; but his military prowess and his statesmanship did not prevent his continuing to gratify his literary and scientific tastes. Upon his father's death in 1740 it seemed for a moment as if he proposed to inaugurate an era of peaceful devotion to the arts and sciences. He dismissed the giant guards whom his father had taken such pains to get together, and recalled to Berlin a famous philosopher and mathematician, Wolf, who years before had been sent off by the devout Frederick William on account of his heretical teachings. He reorganized the Academy of Berlin and hastened to confer personally with the great Voltaire in regard to the new responsibilities which he had now to meet.

The Pragmatic Sanction insures the succession to Maria Theresa

Frederick came to the throne in the spring of 1740. In the autumn the Emperor, Charles VI, died and left his Austrian domains to his eldest daughter, Maria Theresa, then only twenty-three years old, five years younger than her future rival, the king of Prussia. Her father, it will be remembered,

[1] See above, p. 45.

had aspired to the throne of Spain and had most reluctantly acknowledged the Bourbon Philip V, with whom he had continued to fight over their respective claims to Italian territory. Since he had no male relatives to whom the Hapsburg possessions would descend after his death, he labored for years to insure to his daughter, Maria Theresa, the inheritance of all the Austrian lands. In order to do this, he drew up a revised code of laws relating to the rights of succession, which was called the Pragmatic Sanction. This he so arranged as to exclude the daughters of his elder brother and give preference to his own.[1] By promises, concessions of territory, and tedious negotiations, he induced the more important powers of Europe — Russia, Prussia, Holland, Spain, England, and France — to agree to his plan.

Queenly traits of Maria Theresa

For a time it seemed as if no one was going to take advantage of Maria Theresa's inexperience to rob her of any of her outlying possessions. She began immediately to display astonishing energy and aptitude for the business of governing. She patiently attended to all the tiresome matters of state, read long documents and reports, conscientiously consulted her ministers, and conferred with the ambassadors of foreign


[1] LEOPOLD I (1658–1705)
JOSEPH I (1705–1711)
CHARLES VI (1711–1740), last of the Hapsburgs in the male line
Maria Amelia, m. Charles Albert, elector of Bavaria. Emperor as CHARLES VII, 1742–1745
Maria Josephine, m. Augustus III, elector of Saxony
Maria Theresa (d. 1780), m. Francis, ex-duke of Lorraine and grand duke of Tuscany. Emperor as FRANCIS I, 1745–1765
JOSEPH II (1765–1790)
LEOPOLD II (1790–1792)
FRANCIS II (1792–1806). Ruled 1806–1835 as Francis I, emperor of Austria

courts. Her clear judgment, her distinguished bearing, her love of pomp and ceremony, — all helped her to sustain her dignity in the trying circumstances in which she soon found herself. She had none of Frederick's appreciation of culture and, unlike most of her royal contemporaries, she exhibited a contempt for science and philosophy. Nor had she any sympathy with religious toleration; on the contrary she abhorred the sceptical notions of the Prussian king and his admiration for Voltaire.

Polyglot Austrian dominions

The problems which confronted her would have been difficult enough if her realms had been compact and inhabited by people of a single race. The Austrian possessions were, however, as has already been pointed out, a most miscellaneous and scattered collection of territories, great and small, inhabited by a great variety of widely differing races, — Germans in Austria proper, Czechs mixed with Germans in Bohemia and Moravia, Magyars in Hungary, Croatians and Slovenes to the south, Italians in Milan and Tuscany, French and Walloons in the Netherlands. The chief cities of the young queen included such scattered and varied places as Vienna, Pesth, Prague, Milan, Brussels, and Antwerp.

Claimants to the Hapsburg lands

While the Spanish Bourbons might try to increase their Italian territories at her expense, or France encroach upon the Netherlands, Maria Theresa's more natural enemies were nearer home. One of her cousins (the daughters of her father's elder brother, Emperor Joseph I), had married the elector of Saxony; the other, the elector of Bavaria. Both of these princes accordingly laid claim to portions of Maria Theresa's lands; the elector of Saxony wanted Moravia and the elector of Bavaria, Bohemia.

Frederick II seizes Silesia in 1740

It was however none of Maria Theresa's more or less distant relatives that first attacked her, but Frederick of Prussia, whose anxiety to increase the bounds of his kingdom precipitated a series of wars which lasted with scarcely any interruption for nearly a quarter of a century and altered the map of the world

more fundamentally than even the weary War of the Spanish Succession had done. He saw no easier way of forwarding his designs than by robbing the seemingly defenseless Maria Theresa of Silesia, a strip of territory lying to the southeast of Brandenburg.

To save appearances, he offered to join Austria in a firm alliance if she would peacefully cede Silesia to him, but Maria Theresa indignantly replied that she was prepared to defend, not to sell, her subjects. Thereupon, scarcely two months after the death of Charles VI, Frederick marched his army into the coveted district, occupied the important city of Breslau and had soon gained possession of the whole province. He did not take the trouble to declare war, and offered as an excuse for his attack only a vague claim to a part of the land. He remarked, impudently enough, that he was engaged in the finest game in the world and the boldest and most rapidly executed of all the enterprises which princes of his house had ever undertaken.

General alliance directed against Maria Theresa

Maria Theresa got together an army with difficulty, but her troops were hopelessly defeated by the Prussian king at Mollwitz early in April, 1741. Here Frederick's infantry showed the results of all his father's care and discipline, for they withstood like a rock the desperate charges of the Austrian cavalry. This brilliant victory attracted the attention of all the European monarchs, especially those who saw a prospect of following Frederick's example and seizing some part of the defenseless queen's territory. In June France joined Prussia, hoping to weaken her old enemy Austria; to secure the election of her friend, the elector of Bavaria, as Emperor instead of Maria Theresa's husband, Francis; and lastly, to gain the long-coveted Austrian Netherlands. Spain, Sardinia, and Bavaria joined France and Prussia. But Maria Theresa's appeal to England had brought a prompt response from George II who, as elector of Hanover,[1] had reason to fear the increasing power of Prussia,

England supports Austria

[1] See above, p. 48.

NORTH SEA
SWEDEN
BALTIC SEA
R. Niemen
Königsberg
EAST PRUSSIA
R. Elbe
SLESWICK
HOLSTEIN
POMERANIA
Marienburg
EAST FRIESLAND
Hamburg
MECKLENBURG
HANOVER
BRANDENBURG
Berlin
Küstrin
Potsdam
R. Vistula
Warsaw
POLAND
NETHERLANDS
SAXONY
SILESIA
R. Oder
Breslau
Dresden
R. Rhine
BOHEMIA
PALATINATE
BAVARIA
WURTEMBERG
PRUSSIA
at the Accession of
FREDERICK THE GREAT
in 1740
0 50 100
Scale of Miles

NORTH SEA
SWEDEN
BALTIC SEA
R. Niemen
Königsberg
EAST PRUSSIA
R. Elbe
SLESWICK
HOLSTEIN
POMERANIA
Danzig
Marienburg
WEST PRUSSIA
EAST FRIESLAND
Hamburg
MECKLENBURG
HANOVER
BRANDENBURG
Berlin
Potsdam
R. Vistula
Warsaw
POLAND
NETHERLANDS
SAXONY
SILESIA
R. Oder
Hubertsburg
Breslau
Mollwitz
Dresden
R. Rhine
Aix-la-Chapelle
Frankfort
Prague
Kolin
BOHEMIA
MORAVIA
PALATINATE
BAVARIA
WURTEMBERG
Munich
PRUSSIA
at the Death of
FREDERICK THE GREAT
in 1786
0 50 100
Scale of Miles

and consequently induced Parliament to make a grant to aid the young queen in defending herself.

Success of the French and Bavarian troops

The French army joined that of the elector of Bavaria and advanced into Austria. They might easily have taken Vienna itself had it not been that France was not anxious to increase unduly the power of her ally, the Bavarian elector. They accordingly turned into Bohemia, took Prague in November, 1741, and forced the representatives of Bohemia to recognize Charles Albert as their king. Early next year he was duly chosen Emperor, as Charles VII, at Frankfort.

Maria Theresa appeals to Hungary

A great part of Maria Theresa's possessions were now in the hands of her numerous enemies; her army was disorganized and she could look for no considerable aid either from England or Russia, her natural allies. Nevertheless, her courage did not fail, even in the darkest hour. She appealed to her Hungarian subjects. It took a good deal of negotiation to induce them to take part in a war that had already proved so disastrous; but at last their queen roused their enthusiasm and they provided her with soldiers so that she was able in a short time to turn the tide of fortune in her favor.

Austria recovers herself

In February, 1742, on the very day on which Charles Albert was crowned Emperor, one of her armies swept into his capital of Munich, while the other was defeating his French allies. In the summer she came to terms with the Prussian king, who perfidiously deserted his French ally on condition that Maria Theresa should give him Silesia. The Austrian troops forced the French across the Rhine and Charles VII, in spite of his august title, became a sort of vagrant who had to rely upon the French commander for pocket money.

The war broadens out

The war, instead of coming to an end as might have been expected, now broadened out by combining with a war between England and Spain which had begun in 1739, just before the seizure of Silesia by Frederick. The first Bourbon king of Spain, Philip V, became in later life a sad mental and

physical wreck; but his energetic wife, Elizabeth of Parma,[1] did what she could, with the aid of a succession of able ministers, to strengthen her adopted country. The marine forces were increased and the heavy old galleons replaced by more modern ships. Efforts were made, too, to check the smuggling which the English continued to carry on.

War of Jenkins's ear

The English merchants, who had long violated with impunity the Spanish laws, which prohibited them from trading with the West Indies and South America, began to bring home stories of the hardships they had suffered in Spanish prisons. Public opinion was inflamed by the exhibition in the streets of London of the filthy food which was alleged to have been furnished to English seamen who had been so unfortunate as to be caught. It was further reported that Englishmen on lawful voyages had been seized and cruelly dealt with by Spanish officials. One of the many stories in circulation alleged that a certain Captain Jenkins, while engaged in legitimate commerce, had been arrested by the ferocious Spaniards, who had cut off his ear. Whether true or not, Captain Jenkins's tale helped to excite the populace to fever heat.

The pacific Sir Robert Walpole, who was then at the head of English affairs, discouraged a resort to arms and urged a careful investigation of the charges; but he was forced to agree to war in 1739. He declared, when he heard the clamor of bells announcing to the people the commencement of hostilities, "They are ringing the bells now; they will be wringing their hands soon."

France joins Spain against England

The momentous results in India and America of the war thus begun will form the subject of the following chapters. So far as the continent of Europe was concerned, the conflict between England and Spain merged into the general turmoil; for France, instead of being discouraged by her reverses in 1743, made advances to Spain and concluded a "family compact" by which each branch of the Bourbons agreed to

[1] See above, p. 44.

defend the territories of the other. France promised also to help Spain to regain Gibraltar and Minorca, which she had been forced to cede to England,[1] and to win the English colony of Georgia in North America.[2] France, as an ally of Spain, was now at war with England as well as with Austria and at once threw her troops into the Austrian Netherlands, where they won for a time victories as brilliant as those achieved by Louis XIV upon the same battle ground.[3]

Frederick again attacks Austria

Frederick of Prussia knew full well that Maria Theresa was not reconciled to the loss of Silesia, and, with the hope of assuring to himself the continued possession of his new province and perhaps gaining some of Bohemia in addition, he again entered the war. He withdrew, however, a year or so later when Maria Theresa reaffirmed her cession of Silesia to him. France was thus left in the lurch once more while Frederick remarked with easy philosophy, "Happy are they who, having secured their own advantage, can look tranquilly upon the embarrassments of others."

The slight changes ratified at Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748

For four years the war raged in the Austrian Netherlands, in the Rhine valley, in Silesia, Saxony, Italy, North America, and India without bringing permanent gain or glory to any of the combatants, for all the fearful sacrifices of life and treasure. Finally all parties, weary of the long conflict, laid down their arms and agreed to what is called in diplomacy the *status quo ante bellum*, which meant that everything should be restored in general to the conditions which existed before hostilities began.

In the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, France agreed once again to make no further attempt to aid the Stuart pretenders

[1] At the close of the War of the Spanish Succession. See above, p. 43.

[2] See below, p. 110.

[3] The French forces ventured to invade the territory of the United Provinces in 1747. The Dutch, frightened as they had been in 1672 (see above, p. 21), proclaimed William IV, Prince of Orange, *hereditary* stadholder of all the provinces, and so transformed the former republic into a monarchy in all but name.

to regain the English throne.[1] The Pragmatic Sanction and the election of Maria Theresa's husband as Emperor Francis I were ratified by the powers. Little Parma was turned over by Austria to a younger son of Elizabeth of Parma, queen of Spain. England had spent some three hundred and twenty millions of dollars and yet had not succeeded in forcing Spain to promise to stop searching English vessels suspected of smuggling or to remedy any of the other abuses which had led to the war.

The Seven Years' War (1756–1763)

The powers discontented with the settlement of 1748

14. The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle proved to be only a truce, for none of the parties to the settlement were satisfied with the outcome. The question of French and English predominance on the seas and in India and North America was left undecided. Maria Theresa could not reconcile herself to the loss of Silesia; according to an English envoy she forgot that she was a queen and broke into tears like a woman whenever she saw a Silesian. Therefore, when the Tsarina Elizabeth offered her aid in recovering the lost province, she gladly accepted it. Louis XV harbored bitter feelings against his former ally, Frederick, whom he charged with breach of faith in withdrawing from the conflict when he had gained his own ends. On the other hand, Frederick made fun of the French generals and retorted that Louis likewise had thought only of his own interests.

Seven Years' War opens in America

The renewed conflict, which was to involve the Indian rajahs of Hindustan and the colonists of Virginia and New England, began, singularly enough, near the site now occupied by smoky Pittsburg, where General Braddock was defeated

[1] During the war Charles Edward, grandson of James II, had landed in Scotland, gathered the Highland clans about him, and marched southward into England with the hope of wresting the English scepter from George II. France having failed to send the expected aid, he was utterly defeated at Culloden in 1746 and regained the continent only after the most romantic adventures. This episode forever put an end to the attempts of the Stuarts to win back the English throne.

(1755) by the French and their Indian allies in his attempt to take Fort Duquesne. The English captured two French frigates off the coast of Newfoundland and war commenced on the high seas before it was declared in 1756. Frederick the Great was well aware that Maria Theresa was forming a coalition against him and accordingly prudently entered into an alliance with England, who was thereby ranged among the enemies of Austria instead of among her friends as formerly.

Diplomatic revolution brings Austria and France together

The news of Frederick's alliance with England had a powerful effect upon the court of Louis XV. Kaunitz, the able ambassador of Maria Theresa, had been busy trying to bring France over to his side, and he now succeeded; in spite of two hundred years of hostility to the House of Hapsburg, France bound herself to her inveterate enemy in an alliance of friendship and defense. After this astonishing diplomatic revolution the new friends proceeded to plan a partition of Prussia. Maria Theresa was to reduce Frederick's territories to the confined boundaries of a hundred years before, deprive him of his rank of king, and thus thoroughly humiliate him. Russia, Saxony, and Sweden also agreed to join in the concerted attack upon Prussia, and armies gathering from all points of the compass threatened the complete annihilation of Austria's rival.

Critical position of Frederick in 1756

However, it was in this very war that Frederick earned his title of "the Great" and showed himself the equal of the ablest generals that the world has seen, from Alexander of Macedon to Napoleon. Learning the object of the allies, he did not wait for them to declare war upon him; with entire disregard of international law, he invaded Saxony, expelled the elector, assumed the administration of the province, and defeated the Austrians sent against him (1756). The next year, however, he found himself thickly beset with difficulties. Sweden, having joined the coalition against him, occupied East Pomerania; France began to pour an enormous army into his Rhenish provinces; Russian troops invaded Prussia

and overwhelmed the general whom Frederick dispatched against them; and Frederick himself was badly beaten at Kolin by the imperial army.

Frederick wins the battle of Rossbach (November 5, 1757)

Undaunted, nevertheless, Frederick recruited fresh levies, turned to the western part of Saxony to meet the oncoming French troops, and gained one of his most famous victories at the battle of Rossbach against the French and imperial forces. Then swinging back to the east, he worsted the Austrians and Russians a month later at Leuthen in Silesia in a memorable battle which Napoleon afterwards declared would alone have placed the Prussian king among the great generals of all time. For five years more Frederick continued the unequal struggle in Saxony, Silesia, Brandenburg, and Bohemia, sometimes in victory and sometimes in bitter defeat, but subjected to a constant strain on his resources which eventually shattered his splendid army and embittered its intrepid commander.

Frederick's English subsidy is withdrawn

During these trying years one of Frederick's principal sources of support was the annual subsidy of six hundred and seventy thousand pounds, furnished him by William Pitt, then the chief minister in England and director of English operations on land and sea. Unfortunately for Frederick, in the autumn of 1761 Pitt was forced to resign his office owing to the fact that the new sovereign, George III (1760–1820), longed for peace and was especially opposed to the minister's plan for increasing the war burden by fighting the king of Spain, who had just renewed the family compact with France. The subsidies that had so materially helped Frederick in his struggle were now withdrawn and he was advised to make terms with his enemies. Naturally this reversal of the English policy greatly incensed Frederick and inspired him with a stanch hatred for England which he cherished until his death.

Frederick comes to terms with Maria Theresa

The outlook would now have been gloomy indeed for Frederick had it not been for the death of his bitter enemy, the Tsarina Elizabeth of Russia, in 1762. Her successor, Peter III, was a great admirer of Frederick, and promptly concluded peace

with him. Freed thus from further danger on the Russian side, Frederick turned upon the Austrians, drove them out of Silesia, and in November agreed to a truce with Maria Theresa, as a preliminary to a final settlement which was reached at Hubertsburg in Saxony in February, 1763. The Seven Years' War brought to Frederick only a renewed confirmation of his claim to the Silesian province; to Austria an enormous war debt and the promise of the Prussian king to assist Maria Theresa's son, Joseph II, in securing the succession to his father as Emperor.

Treaty of Paris, 1763; France forced to cede Canada to England

Meanwhile France and England brought their maritime and colonial struggle to a close in a treaty of peace signed at Paris in February, 1763. This settlement was most disastrous for Louis XV who, instead of the glory and dominion he had sought, found only defeat and ruin. The great empire which the French colonists had been building up in the valley of the St. Lawrence and east of the Mississippi for more than a century had to be surrendered to England. Though France retained five trading posts in India, they were not to be fortified, and thus the hopes of conquering Hindustan which she had cherished during recent years came to naught. England, on the other hand, emerged from the conflict incontestably mistress of the seas and the world's greatest colonial power.

Disastrous results of France's alliance with Austria

In addition to the discredit resulting from these grave territorial losses, Louis XV had become burdened by a connection with the House of Austria, which was thoroughly unpopular with his subjects, and he had incurred a great war debt which helped materially to bring on in later years the financial disaster which precipitated the French Revolution.

Three Partitions of Poland, 1772, 1793, and 1795

15. Frederick's success in seizing and holding one of Austria's finest provinces did not satisfy him. The central portions of his kingdom — Brandenburg, Silesia, and Pomerania

— were completely cut off from East Prussia by a considerable tract known as West Prussia, which belonged to the kingdom of Poland. The map will show how great must have been Frederick's temptation to fill this gap, especially as Poland was in no condition to defend its possessions.

Origin of the kingdom of Poland

The Poles, a Slavic people, begin to be heard of in the history of the tenth century. Their first great ruler, Boleslav I (992–1025), built up a considerable kingdom between the Oder and the Vistula, and his people were converted to the Roman Catholic faith. After a long period of weakness, the kingdom was revived and strengthened in the fourteenth century. In 1386 a Polish princess married Jagello, grand duke of Lithuania, a region twice as large as Poland, which lay to the east of it and was inhabited chiefly by Russians. As time went on Poland and Lithuania were gradually welded together and came to be considered a single country. To the north of Poland lay the region conquered by the Teutonic Knights[1] and colonized by Germans. After long conflicts, one of Jagello's successors wrested from the knights the province of West Prussia, with its strong fortress of Marienburg and the flourishing German towns of Danzig and Thorn. A single diet, or national assembly, was established in 1468 for the whole motley realm of the king of Poland.

Lithuania added to Poland

Poland gains West Prussia

Mixed population and discordant religions in Poland

With the exception of Russia, Poland was the largest kingdom in Europe. It covered an immense plain with no natural boundaries, and the population, which was very thinly scattered, belonged to several races. Besides the Poles themselves there were Germans in the cities of West Prussia, and the Lithuanians and Russians in Lithuania. The Jews were very numerous everywhere, forming half of the population in some of the towns. The Poles were usually Catholics, while the Germans were Protestants, and the Russians adhered to the Greek Church. These differences in religion, added to those of race, created endless difficulties and dissensions. There were many

[1] See above, p. 56.

Jesuits in Poland and the intolerance of the Roman Catholics led to the expulsion from the diet of all "dissenters," as the members of the Protestant and the Greek churches were called. In 1733 the dissenters were deprived of all political rights.

The defective system of government

The government of Poland was the worst imaginable. Instead of having developed a strong monarchy, as her neighbors — Prussia, Russia, and Austria — had done, she remained in a state of feudal anarchy which the nobles had taken the greatest pains to perpetuate by binding their kings in such a way that they had no power either to maintain order or to defend the country from attack. The king could not declare war, make peace, impose taxes, or pass any law without the consent of the diet. As the diet was composed of representatives of the nobility, any one of whom could freely veto any measure, — for no measure could pass that had even one vote against it, — most of the diets broke up without accomplishing anything.

The *liberum veto*

The elective kingship

The kingship was not hereditary in Poland, but each time the ruler died the nobles assembled and chose a new one, commonly a foreigner. These elections were tumultuous and the various European powers regularly interfered, by force or bribery, to secure the election of a candidate whom they believed would favor their interests.

The Polish nobles and peasants

The nobles in Poland were very numerous. There were perhaps a million and a half of them, mostly very poor, owning only a trifling bit of land. There was a saying that the poor noble's dog, even if he sat in the middle of the estate, was sure to have his tail upon a neighbor's land. It was the few rich and powerful families that really controlled such government as might be said to have existed in Poland. There was no middle class except in the few German towns. In the Polish and Lithuanian towns such industry and commerce as existed were in the hands of the Jews, who were not recognized as citizens and who both oppressed and were oppressed. The peasants were miserable indeed. They had sunk from serfs to slaves

over whom their lords had the right of life and death. They owed all the fruits of their labor to their lords and were mere chattels, living in incredible and hopeless filth and misery. There was for them no king, no law but the will of their masters, no country but the manor on which they were born and to which they belonged like the cattle in the fields.

Rousseau's view of Poland

The French philosopher Rousseau thus describes the conditions: "As one reads the history of Poland, he wonders how a government so fantastically arranged could have lasted so long: a huge body made up of a great number of dead members and a few live ones which are so disunited as to be independent of one another; a body which acts violently but accomplishes nothing; which cannot resist any one who chooses to attack it; which breaks up altogether five or six times in a century, and which has a stroke of paralysis when any effort is necessary; and yet in spite of all this still survives and exhibits no little vigor." [1]

Catharine II and Frederick II agree on Polish matters, 1764

It required no great insight to foresee that Poland was in danger of falling a prey to its greedy and powerful neighbors, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, who clamped in the unfortunate kingdom on all sides. They had long shamelessly interfered in its affairs and had actually taken active measures to oppose all reforms of the constitution in order that they might profit by the existing anarchy. As we have seen, a general war had broken out in 1733 when Louis XV, backed up by Spain, endeavored to place his father-in-law, Stanislas Lesczinski, upon the throne in opposition to a Saxon prince, Augustus III, who was supported by Austria and Russia. Augustus III died in 1763, just as the Seven Years' War had been brought to a close, and Frederick immediately arranged with the new Russian ruler, the famous Catharine II, to put upon the vacant throne her favorite, Poniatowski, who took the title of Stanislas II.

[1] Rousseau's *Considerations upon the Government of Poland*, written in 1771, just before the first partition.

Since Catharine was to play a conspicuous rôle in all the affairs of Europe for thirty-five years, a word must be said of the manner in which this German woman became the ruler of all the Russias. She was the daughter of one of Frederick the Great's officers and had been selected by him in 1743, at the request of the Tsarina Elizabeth, as a suitable wife for Peter, the heir to the throne. At the age of fourteen this inexperienced girl found herself in the midst of the intrigues of the court at St. Petersburg; she joined the Greek Church, exchanged her name of Sophia for that of Catharine, and, by zealous study of both books and men, prepared to make her new name famous.

Catharine II, empress of Russia (1762–1796)

Her husband proved to be a worthless fellow who early began to neglect and maltreat her. When he came to the throne in 1762, he frightened the clergy by threatening to confiscate their lands, alienated the soldiers by his admiration for the Prussian uniforms and discipline, and lost the respect of every one by his drunken and dissolute life. Catharine won over the imperial guard and had herself proclaimed empress. Peter was forced to abdicate and was carried off by some of Catharine's supporters, who put him to death, probably with her tacit consent.

Murder of Tsar Peter, 1762

In the spirit of Peter the Great, Catharine determined to carry on the Europeanizing of Russia and extend her empire. She was unquestionably a bad woman morally, thoroughly unscrupulous and hypocritical, but she was shrewd in the choice and management of her ministers and was herself a hard worker. She rose at six o'clock in the morning, hurried through her toilet, prepared her own light breakfast, and turned to the exacting and dull business of government, carefully considering the reports laid before her relating to the army, the navy, finances, and foreign affairs. She read and admired the writings of Voltaire and the various other French philosophers and reformers, whom she welcomed at her court whenever she could induce them to visit her. She was, in short, a sort of

Catharine's character

Frederick the Great, sharing his energy and patience, his anxiety to better his country, his love of learning and of power, and his cynical unscrupulousness.

Russia and Prussia agree to prevent reforms in Poland

To return to Poland, Catharine was disappointed in Stanislas Poniatowski, who showed himself favorable to reform. He even proposed to do away with the *liberum veto*, — the sacred right of any member of the diet to block a measure no matter how salutary. Russia, however, supported by Prussia, intervened to demand that the *liberum veto*, which insured continued anarchy, should be maintained and that the adherents of the Protestant and Greek churches should be granted reasonable rights. The diet most unwisely determined to maintain the *liberum veto*, but refused to exhibit the least tolerance toward the dissenters. Then came several years of civil war between the several factions, a war in which the Russians freely intervened.

Catharine involved in war with Turkey

Meanwhile France, in order to direct Catharine's attention to another quarter, encouraged the Turks to attack her; but Catharine's armies gained victory after victory. She sent a fleet around through the North Sea into the Mediterranean (1770) which destroyed the Turkish squadron in the Ægean Sea. Her forces occupied the coast of the Black Sea and seemed ready to cross the Balkan Mountains and perhaps put an end to the Turkish power in Europe.

Austria agrees to the partition of Poland

Austria was thoroughly alarmed by the prospect of having Russia for a neighbor on the southeast instead of the ever-weakening Turks. She consequently approached her old enemy, Frederick, and between them, they decided that Russia should be allowed to take a portion of Poland if she would consent to give up most of her Turkish conquests; then Austria, in order to maintain the balance of power, should be given a slice of Poland and Frederick should take the longed-for West Prussia.

Accordingly in 1772 Poland's three neighbors arranged to take each a portion of the distracted kingdom. Austria was

THE PARTITION OF POLAND
50 0 50 100 150 200
Scale of Miles.
Territories taken by Russia
Territories taken by Austria
Territories taken by Prussia
BALTIC SEA
SWEDEN
RUSSIA
St. Petersburg
Gotland
Gulf of Riga
CURLAND
Riga
Liban
Mitau
To Russia in 1795
To Russia in 1772
Memel
Königsberg
LITHUANIA
POMERANIA
Dantzig
Marienburg
EAST PRUSSIA
To Prussia in 1772
To Prussia in 1795
Thorn
Grodno
WHITE RUSSIA
To Russia in 1793
Posen
Gnesen
BLACK RUSSIA
Warsaw
To Prussia in 1793
To Austria in 1795
RED RUSSIA
Lublin
Vladimir
LITTLE RUSSIA
Kiev
Cracow
LUDOMERIA
Lemberg
To Austria in 1772
AUSTRIA
Brünn
GALICIA
CARPATHIAN MOUNTAINS
Vienna
Buda Pest
HUNGARY
MOLDAVIA
TRANSYLVANIA
BLACK SEA
THE M. N. WORKS, BUFFALO.

assigned a strip inhabited by almost three million Poles and Russians and thus added two new kinds of people and two new languages to her already varied collection of races and tongues. Prussia was given a smaller piece, but it was the coveted West Prussia which she needed to fill out her boundaries, and its inhabitants were to a considerable extent Germans and Protestants. Russia's strip on the east was inhabited entirely by Russians. The Polish diet was forced, by the advance of Russian troops to Warsaw, to approve the partition.

First partition of Poland, 1772

This outrageous mutilation of an ancient kingdom, which had once been one of the most important in Europe, awakened general indignation and touched the seared consciences of men who had become accustomed to see thousands of soldiers killed and hundreds of towns sacked in order to secure a trifling addition of territory to France or a throne for the queen of Spain's son. Even those who had shared the booty showed signs of shame, especially Maria Theresa, who wept while she reached out her hand for her share. But this first dismemberment of Poland was only the prelude to its complete extinction and to other equally scandalous and violent depredations during the French Revolution and Napoleonic periods, as will appear in good time.

Europe shocked by the partition of Poland

Poland seemed at first, however, to have learned a great lesson from the disaster. During the twenty years following its first dismemberment there was an extraordinary revival in education, art, and literature; the old universities at Vilna and Cracow were reorganized and many new schools established. King Stanislas Poniatowski summoned French and Italian artists and entered into correspondence with the French philosophers and reformers. Historians and poets sprang up to give distinction to the last days of Polish independence. The old intolerance and bigotry decreased and, above all, the constitution which had made Poland the laughingstock and the victim of its neighbors was abolished and an entirely new one worked out.

Revival of Poland, 1772–1791

The new Polish constitution of 1791

The new Polish constitution, approved on May 3, 1791, did away with the *liberum veto*, made the crown hereditary, established a parliament something like that of England — in short, gave to the king power enough to conduct the government efficiently and yet made him and his ministers dependent upon the representatives of the nation.

Catharine frustrates the reform

There was a party, however, which regretted the changes and feared that they might result in time in doing away with the absolute control of the nobles over the peasants. These opponents of reform appealed to Catharine for aid. She, mindful as always of her own interests, denounced all changes in a government "under which the Polish republic had flourished for so many centuries," and declared that the reformers were no better than the abhorred French Jacobins who were busy destroying the power of their king.[1] She sent her soldiers and her wild Cossacks into Poland, and the enemies of the new constitution were able with her help to undo all that had been done and to reëstablish the *liberum veto*.

Second partition of Poland, 1793

Not satisfied with plunging Poland into its former anarchy, Russia and Prussia determined to rob her of still more territory. Frederick the Great's successor, Frederick William II, ordered his forces across his eastern boundary on the ground that Danzig was sending grain to the French Revolutionists, that Poland was infested with Jacobins, and that, in general, she threatened the tranquillity of her neighbors. Prussia cut deep into Poland, added a million and a half of Poles to her subjects and acquired the towns of Thorn, Danzig, and Posen. Russia's gains were three millions of people, who at least belonged to her own race. On this occasion Austria was put off with the promises of her confederates, Russia and Prussia, that they would use their good offices to secure Bavaria for her in exchange for the Austrian Netherlands.

At this juncture the Poles found a national leader in the brave Kosciusco, who had fought under Washington for American

[1] See below, sect. 37.

liberty. With the utmost care and secrecy, he organized an insurrection in the spring of 1794 and summoned the Polish people to join his standard of national independence. The Poles who had been incorporated into the Prussian monarchy thereupon rose and forced Frederick William to withdraw his forces.

Revolt of Poles under Kosciusco, 1794

Catharine was ready, however, to crush the patriots. Kosciusco was wounded and captured in battle, and by the end of the year Russia was in control of Warsaw. The Polish king was compelled to abdicate, and the remnants of the dismembered kingdom were divided, after much bitter contention, among Austria, Russia, and Prussia. In the three partitions which blotted out the kingdom of Poland from the map of Europe, Russia received nearly all of the old grand duchy of Lithuania, or nearly twice the combined shares of Austria and Prussia.

Third and final partition, 1795

REFERENCES

The Youth of Frederick the Great: HENDERSON, *Short History of Germany*, Vol. II, pp. 111–122.

Maria Theresa and the First Silesian War: HENDERSON, Vol. II, pp. 123–148; KITCHIN, *History of France*, Vol. III, pp. 409–425; PERKINS, *France under Louis XV*, Vol. I, pp. 164–205, 346–378; BRIGHT, *Maria Theresa*, pp. 1–63.

Walpole and the Spanish War: GREEN, *Short History of the English People*, chap. ix, pp. 732–734; MORLEY, *Walpole*.

Frederick the Great and the Seven Years' War: HASSALL, *European History, 1715–1789*, pp. 241–279; KITCHIN, Vol. III, pp. 445–468; PERKINS, Vol. II, pp. 85–177; HENDERSON, Vol. II, pp. 149–181; BRIGHT, pp. 135–187.

Pitt and the Seven Years' War: GREEN, chap. x, pp. 735–757.

Poland in the Eighteenth Century: RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, Vol. II, pp. 184–192; MORFILL, *Poland*.

The Partition of Poland: HASSALL, pp. 312–318; RAMBAUD, Vol. II, pp. 192–197, 232–245; PERKINS, Vol. II, pp. 285–309.

Final Destruction of Poland: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. xvii; STEPHENS, *European History, 1789–1815*, pp. 103–105, 151–153.

Catharine II: RAMBAUD, Vol. II, pp. 183–247; BURY, *Catherine II* (Foreign Statesmen Series).

CHAPTER VI

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND FOR INDIA

How Europe began to extend its Commerce over the Whole World

16. The long and disastrous wars of the eighteenth century which we have been reviewing seem, from the standpoint of the changes they produced in Europe, to have been scarcely worth our attention. It was not a vital question in the world's history whether a member of the House of Bourbon or of the House of Hapsburg sat on the throne of Spain, whether Silesia belonged to Frederick or Maria Theresa, or even whether Poland continued to exist or not. But alongside of these contentions among the various dynasties and these shiftings of territory were other interests far beyond the confines of Europe, and to these we must now turn.

The history of Europe only to be explained by the history of Europe's colonies

Constant wars have been waged during the past two centuries by the European nations in their efforts to extend and defend their distant possessions. The War of the Spanish Succession concerned the trade as well as the throne of Spain. The internal affairs of each country have been constantly influenced by the demands of its merchants and the achievements of its sailors and soldiers, fighting rival nations or alien peoples thousands of miles from London, Paris, or Vienna. The great manufacturing towns of England — Leeds, Manchester, and Birmingham — owe their prosperity to India, China, and Australia. Liverpool, Amsterdam, and Hamburg, with their long lines of docks and warehouses and their fleets of merchant vessels, would dwindle away if their trade were confined to the demands of their European neighbors. It was in the eighteenth

century that European history became linked for the first time with world history.

Vast extent of the European colonial dominion

Europe includes scarcely a twelfth of the land upon the globe and yet over three fifths of the world is to-day either occupied by peoples of European origin or ruled by European states. The possessions of France in Asia and Africa exceed the entire area of Europe; even the little kingdom of the Netherlands administers a colonial dominion three times the size of the German Empire. The British Empire, of which the island of Great Britain constitutes but a hundredth part, includes one fifth of the world's dry land. Moreover European peoples have populated the United States, which is nearly as large as all of Europe, and rule all of Mexico and South America.

In the present chapter the origin of European colonization will be briefly explained, as well as the manner in which England succeeded in extending her sway over the teeming millions of India. In the next chapter we shall review England's victory over France in the western hemisphere. In this way the real meaning of the Seven Years' War will become clear.

Narrow limits of the ancient and mediæval world

The widening of the field of European history is one of the most striking features of modern times. Though the Greeks and Romans carried on a large trade in silks, spices, and precious stones with India and China, they really knew little of the world beyond southern Europe, northern Africa, and western Asia, and much that they knew was forgotten during the Middle Ages. Slowly, however, the interest in the East revived and travelers began to add to the scanty knowledge handed down from antiquity.

Travels of Marco Polo in the thirteenth century

The Crusades took many Europeans as far east as Egypt and Syria. In the latter part of the thirteenth century two Venetian merchants, the Polo brothers, visited China and were kindly received at Pekin by the emperor of the Mongols. On a second journey they were accompanied by Marco Polo, the son of one of the brothers. When he got safely back to Venice

in 1295, after a journey of twenty years, Marco gave an account of his experiences which filled his readers with wonder. Nothing stimulated the interest of the West in the East more than his fabulous description of the golden island of Zipango (Japan) and of the spice markets of the Moluccas and Ceylon.

Discoveries of the Portuguese in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries

About the same year Venice and Genoa opened up direct communication by sea with the towns of the Netherlands and with England. Their fleets touched at the ports of Lisbon and aroused the commercial enterprise of the Portuguese, who soon began to undertake extended maritime expeditions. By the middle of the fourteenth century they had discovered the Canary Islands, Madeira, and the Azores. Before this time no one had ventured along the coast of Africa beyond the arid region of the Sahara. The country was forbidding, there were no ports, and mariners, moreover, were discouraged in their progress by the general belief that the torrid region was uninhabitable. In 1445, however, some adventurous sailors came in sight of a headland beyond the desert and, struck by its luxuriant growth of tropical trees, they called it Cape Verde (the green cape). Its discovery put an end once for all to the idea that there were only parched deserts to the south.

Portuguese round the Cape of Good Hope, 1486, and reach India by sea, 1498

For a generation longer the Portuguese continued to venture farther and farther along the coast in the hope of finding it coming to an end so that they might make their way by sea to India. At last, in 1486, Diaz rounded the Cape of Good Hope. Twelve years later (1498) Vasco da Gama, spurred on by Columbus's great discovery, after sailing around the Cape of Good Hope and northward beyond Zanzibar, steered straight across the Indian Ocean and reached Calicut in India by sea, thus opening up a new trade route of which Portuguese sailors, under the direction of the government, were not slow to take advantage.

As fleet after fleet of Portuguese merchantmen appeared in Eastern waters, they excited the natural suspicion of the Mohammedan merchants who had long enjoyed a monopoly



The Voyages of Discovery

The Portuguese enjoy control of the East Indian trade in the sixteenth century

of the trade between the East Indies and the eastern ports of the Mediterranean, where the products were handed over to Italian merchants to distribute to Western nations. They were unable, however, to drive the newcomers away. So for a long time the Portuguese held a preëminent place as a maritime power and had the satisfaction of seeing the Italian towns decay as Lisbon grew in wealth and importance. They occupied Muscat in Arabia, Ormuz at the entrance of the Persian Gulf, Goa, Calicut, and other points on the Indian peninsula and the shores of the neighboring island of Ceylon.

The Portuguese were, however, by no means content with supplanting the Mohammedan merchants in the Indian Ocean. Albuquerque got control of Malacca in 1511 and sent on three ships through the narrow straits into the mysterious Malay Archipelago whence came the specially rare spices, nutmeg and cloves. The adventurous mariners crossed the equator, skirted along Sumatra and Java, and, passing the great island of Borneo, finally reached their goal, the Moluccas or Spice Islands *par excellence*, which lie two thousand miles beyond the straits of Malacca.[1]

Vast extent of the Malay Archipelago

In order to give a just idea of the vast extent of the Malay Archipelago a little map on the following page shows the outlines of the United States superimposed upon the region which lies between the Andaman Islands and the Spice Islands. It will be observed that it is about as far from the western point of Sumatra to the western point of New Guinea as from Portland, Maine, to San Francisco, that is, some three thousand

[1] There is no doubt that the desire to obtain spices was the main reason for the exploration of the globe. This motive led European navigators to try in succession every possible way to reach the East — by going around Africa, by sailing west in the hope of reaching the Indies, before they knew of the existence of America; then, after America was discovered, by sailing around it to the north or south, and even sailing around Europe to the north. It is hard for us to understand this enthusiasm for spices, for which we care much less nowadays. One former use of spices was to preserve food, which could not then, as now, be carried rapidly, while still fresh, from place to place; nor did our conveniences then exist for keeping it by the use of ice. Moreover, spice served to make even spoiled food more palatable than it would otherwise have been.

miles. The island of Sumatra is a good deal larger than Great Britain and Ireland, and Borneo considerably exceeds in size the whole of France or of the present German Empire. Java, which is but a little smaller than England and Wales, has a population now of nearly thirty millions. The other islands are, however, much less densely populated, and much of Borneo is still unexplored to the present day. Australia scarcely attracted



The Malay Archipelago as compared with the Area of the United States

the attention of the early navigators, and it was left for England to occupy that continent in the nineteenth century and establish flourishing colonies there.[1]

The Dutch supplant the Portuguese in the seventeenth century

In accordance with the spirit of the time the Portuguese sought to monopolize their new trade and exclude all other nations. They succeeded in this only for a short time. The Dutch, who had learned something of the profits of the spice trade by distributing among the northern ports of Europe the products which the Portuguese ships landed at Lisbon, decided to engage in the Eastern trade on their own account. Portugal

[1] See below, sect. 90.

found itself at a serious disadvantage in the contest with the Dutch, for she had come under the Spanish crown in 1580 and the Spanish were much more interested in the gold and silver mines of America than in the trade with the East. They did not have ships enough to police the seas of two hemispheres, especially after the English had destroyed their mighty Armada in 1588. The Dutch had therefore little to fear from the Portuguese when, in 1595, they sent out their first expedition to India. They rapidly established trading houses and seized one by one the most favorable stations which the Portuguese had selected and occupied, until by the close of the seventeenth century only Goa and a few minor trading posts remained from the vast commercial empire which the Portuguese had built up.[1]

Origin of the English East India Company

Meanwhile the energetic Dutch discovered redoubtable competitors in the English, who were not inclined to sit idly by and have their neighbors reap an enormous profit from the products which they brought to England to sell. As early as 1591 some English traders had sent out an expedition of their own from Plymouth and, although it was not successful, other merchants, in London, were not daunted, for in 1600 they organized the English East India Company and secured a charter from Queen Elizabeth. This company was given a monopoly of the Indian trade, authorized to make rules for its own government, to secure trading posts, and to defend its own interests.

Nature of the early rivalry among the trading companies

The organization of companies by the English, Dutch, and French was rendered necessary by reason of the considerable capital required in fitting out ships and maintaining numerous trading stations; and also on account of the jealousy which existed among the traders of the various European nations. The doors of a great treasure-house had been thrown open, and the share which each was to get depended on his prowess and

[1] These points the Portuguese managed to hold through the wars and revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and they retain in the East to-day Goa and Diu in India, Timor in the Malay Archipelago, Macao near Hongkong, and two or three minor stations.

fighting strength. Whatever the terms of their charters, the great companies were practically licensed to wage war against one another, and they equipped their vessels with guns and men to carry on naval and land operations.[1]

Private warfare for trade

England gains a Foothold in India

17. It was therefore really a war for trade into which the English company entered when it sent out its first fleet in 1601 under the command of James Lancaster. The expedition reached Sumatra in June of the following year, and, after the ships were loaded with spices from the Moluccas, it was decided to establish an English station at Bantam in Java. Other voyages followed at intervals of from two to three years, and in 1612 the English, after defeating the Portuguese at sea near Surat, on the west coast of Hindustan, were permitted to establish a trading center there. Four years later Jehangir, the Great Mogul of India, was induced by Sir Thomas Roe, the ambassador of King James I, to permit the English merchants to live and trade in his kingdoms. He gives a general command that "what goods soever they desire to sell or buy they may have free liberty without any restraint; and at what port soever they shall arrive, that neither Portugal nor any other shall dare to molest their quiet; and in what city soever they shall have residence, I have commanded all my governors and captains to give them freedom answerable to their own desires, to sell, buy, and to transport into their country at their pleasure." [2]

The Great Mogul permits the English merchants to trade freely in India, 1616

[1] So general was the recognition of this private warfare among the merchants of the different nations that Spain and France, in a treaty in 1598, frankly stipulated that everything west of the Canary Islands should be left to the test of force. In 1622, when England and Portugal were at peace, the agents of the English company at Surat fitted out a small fleet, sailed to Ormuz, bombarded the town, took the Portuguese on board their ships, and transferred them to Goa. This wanton act, which apparently caused no trouble at home, would to-day be regarded as a just cause of war.

[2] See whole of this letter from Jehangir to James I in *Readings*, sect. 17.

The "factories"

Originally the English had no idea of conquering any part of Hindustan. They did no more than establish agencies, or "factories,"[1] as they were called. These were trading settlements where one would find a great warehouse in which were stored the goods brought from England for sale in India, and the Indian commodities which the native merchants, or the Englishmen who penetrated into the interior, collected to be shipped to England. Around the warehouse were the houses of the agents of the East India Company built in a fashion more suited to European needs than were the native dwellings. Sometimes the entire settlement was surrounded by fortifications, especially after it was found that the richly stocked warehouses might be sacked by native marauders. About 1640 the English established a factory at Hugli, near the mouths of the Ganges in Bengal, one of the richest of the Indian provinces.[2] About the same time they built Fort St. George at Madras, nearly a thousand miles down the coast, on the first land actually acquired by them.

Conflicts between the English and Dutch merchants

As has been said, it was the Dutch, not the Portuguese, who were the most serious rivals of the English merchants, especially when the latter sent their ships three thousand miles to the eastward of India to the Spice Islands, where they proposed to get their share of the nutmeg, mace, and cloves. The Dutch claimed exclusive rights to the particularly precious islands of Banda and Amboyna, where the rarest spices grew; and for a time they seemed to have the advantage. They owned more than half of the merchant ships of Europe, and consequently Rotterdam and Amsterdam enjoyed a great part of the profits which resulted from carrying goods to the East and then returning to supply England and the ports of the continent with the spices, precious stones, ivory, and rich fabrics of the Orient.

[1] Derived from "factor," which means "agent," especially a commission merchant.

[2] This station was later transferred to Calcutta, a few miles away.

Oliver Cromwell, during his brief period of power, tried to reduce the Dutch trade and encourage English shipping by the Navigation Act which Parliament passed in 1651. This provided that only English vessels should be permitted to bring to England commodities produced in Asia, Africa, or America. The result was a short, brisk commercial war between the Dutch and the English, fought at sea, in which sometimes one fleet, sometimes the other, gained the upper hand. This conflict is notable as the first example of a distinctly commercial struggle. Nations were beginning to go to war over trade instead of over religion.

The Navigation Act of 1651

On the restoration of Charles II in 1660, the English, after almost twenty years of civil war and disorder, were ready to devote themselves more seriously to the defending and extending of their trade and their colonies in the East and the West. The king granted a new charter to the East India Company which gave it a monopoly of the trade with the right to coin money, administer justice, punish independent English merchants who sailed ships into eastern waters on their own account, and finally to wage war and make peace with non-Christian states. Cromwell's Navigation Act was reënforced by additional provisions to the effect that not only must the ships be owned and manned by Englishmen but they must be English-built as well; and English agents were ordered to prevent the Dutch from getting any of the English trade. Charles II also dispatched troops to the company's settlements to help defend them against attacks from Europeans and natives. He also turned over to the company the town of Bombay, which his Portuguese wife had brought him as her dowry. This soon (1685) became the headquarters of the company (instead of Surat) and is now the second greatest emporium of Indian trade.

The English government favors the East India Company

The old war with Holland, begun under Cromwell, was renewed under Charles II. The two nations were very evenly matched on the sea, but in 1664 the English succeeded in seizing some of the West Indian Islands from the Dutch as

Second commercial war with Holland

well as their colony upon Manhattan Island, which was renamed New York in honor of the king's brother, the duke of York. On the other hand, the Dutch expelled the English from their last foothold in the Spice Islands (1667). Five years later Charles II was induced by his friend Louis XIV to attack the Dutch once more, — those "eternal enemies" of England, who were to be utterly destroyed as Carthage had been blotted out by the Romans.

Dutch and English ally themselves against France

But the war, as we have already seen, resulted in a victory for the Dutch,[1] who soon joined the English against the menacing power of Louis XIV and in 1688 sent their stadholder over to occupy the vacant English throne. Their strength had, however, been exhausted in the long wars with Louis XIV and they gave up the attempt to oppose England in India. Yet, although they no longer dominated the seas as they had earlier done, the Dutch still held important possessions and enjoyed a flourishing trade at the opening of the eighteenth century.

The Dutch during the eighteenth century

The business of their East India Company was so profitable and the dividends so large that the stock continued to be rated at two or three times its original value. The Dutch held the Cape of Good Hope, which they had taken as a halfway post on the way to India, the island of Ceylon, some important centers on the mainland of India, actual dominion or predominance in the Spice Islands, Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, the Malaccan peninsula, and Siam. They monopolized the European trade with Japan and the greater portion of the spice business. Nevertheless their advance was checked, and it was not they but the French who were now to fight with England for the control of India and North America.[2]

[1] See above, p. 21.

[2] In spite of the severe losses growing out of the wars at the close of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, the Dutch now hold Java, Sumatra, Celebes, the Molucca Islands, portions of Borneo, and other islands in the East, comprising an area of over 700,000 square miles with a population of some 36,000,000.

How France established herself in India

The ambitions of Louis XIV had not been confined to punishing the Dutch, making "reunions" at the expense of his neighbors, and assuring the Spanish throne to his grandson. In 1664, under the influence of Colbert, the king chartered the French East India Company, granting it a monopoly of trade for fifty years, the right to cast cannons, raise troops, and garrison posts, and to declare war and make peace in the name of their sovereign. The king also assisted the company with large grants from the royal treasury in overcoming the difficulties which the enterprise necessarily involved.[1]

Extent of French holdings in India

In 1669 the first French expedition under the new company arrived at Surat where they established a factory beside those of the English and Portuguese, from which they sent out their agents in every direction. Three years later the French became the rivals of the English in Bengal by fortifying themselves at Chandarnagar just north of Calcutta. They also purchased from the ruler of the Carnatic, on the eastern shores of the Deccan, a plot of ground of about one hundred and thirteen acres, upon which was the village of Pondicherry, destined to be the capital of the French dominions in India.[2]

In order to follow the approaching struggle between the English and French companies for the control of India, we must pause a moment to consider this extraordinary country and the conditions which existed at the opening of the eighteenth century.

India and the Struggle between England and France for its Possession

18. India was neither a group of half-savage islands nor, like North America, a sparsely inhabited region awaiting development; it was a vast empire, swarming with millions of people,

[1] For fifty or sixty years French merchants had been going to India; and Richelieu had reorganized a company which had been established as early as 1604. It is unnecessary to say more of these beginnings.

[2] They had also a factory at Masulipatam and minor stations at Calicut, Golconda, and a few other points.

the seat of an ancient and highly elaborate civilization. It had given birth to philosophies and religions which had dominated the lives of myriads of men not only in India itself but in China and Japan. Geographically, India occupies the triangular peninsula which juts southward from the continent of Asia and is shut in by lofty mountain ranges from the countries to the north and west. One may gain an idea of its extent by laying the map of Hindustan upon that of the United States. If the southernmost point, Cape Comorin, be placed over New Orleans, Calcutta will lie nearly over New York City, and Bombay in the neighborhood of Des Moines, Iowa.

Geographical divisions of Hindustan

The Indian peninsula is separated into three great divisions. In the extreme north are the regions of the Himalaya Mountains and their foothills. South of these are plains and the valleys of a network of rivers draining into the mighty Ganges, which flows southeastward for fifteen hundred miles into the Bay of Bengal, refreshing and fertilizing one of the most thickly populated districts of the world. The third region is the table-land of southern India, broken in many places, especially near the seacoast, by minor mountain ranges and principally drained by rivers running eastward into the Bay of Bengal.

Climate and products of India

While all variations of climate may be found in India, from the extreme heat of the tropical regions near the equator to the temperate climate of the north and the eternal winter of the Himalayas, generally speaking the heat and humidity of the atmosphere make the country rather unsuited to men accustomed to the colder and drier climes of the North. India yields almost all the mineral and vegetable products which are the objects of modern commerce. The northern valleys of the Ganges and its tributaries furnish cotton, tobacco, indigo, spices, dyes, opium, silk, rice, and grain; while the southern table-lands, in addition to grain and cotton, afford a variety of minerals and precious stones, among which are the famous diamonds of Golconda.


Longitude East from Greenwich
68
72
76
80
84
88
92
36
32
28
24
20
16
12
8
4
CHINESE EMPIRE
TIBET
AFGHANS
BELOOCHEES
Cabul
Peshawur
Lahore
Moultan
Delhi
Meerut
Muttra
Agra
Ajmir
Gwalior
Lucknow
Cawnpore
Allahabad
Benares
Ruxar
Patna
Moorshedabad
Plassey
Dacca
Chandarnagar
Chinsura
Calcutta
Fort William
Baroda
Indore
Surat
Diu I.
Gujerat
Nagpur
Assaye
Aurungabad
Salsette I.
Bombay
Poonah
Jeypur
Puri
Gandjam
Golconda
Hyderabad
Masulipatam
Goa
Madras
Pondicherry
Ft. St. David
Seringapatam
Tellicherry
Mysore
Mahe
Calicut
Laccadive Islands
Tanjore
Trincomalee
CEYLON
Colombo
Kandy
Gulf of Manaar
C. Comorin
Gulf of Cambay
G. of Cutch
Kurrachee
Sinde
Punjab
NEPAUL
BHOTAN
MAHRATTA STATES
NIZAM OF HYDERABAD
MYSORE
BENGAL
BAY OF BENGAL
ARABIAN SEA
Malabar Coast
Coromandel Coast
DECCAN
R. Indus
R. Jhelum
R. Chenab
R. Ravi
R. Sutlej
R. Ganges
R. Jumna
R. Luni
R. Chambal
R. Nerbudda
R. Tapti
R. Mahanuddy
R. Godavery
R. Kistna
R. Toongbudra
R. Penaur
R. Palaur
R. Brahmaputra
R. Hugli
R. Soane
R. Purna
R. Wurdhah
Travancore
Cochin
Ft. St. George
Wandewash
INDIA
about 1763
0 100 200 300
Scale of Miles
English Possessions
French Possessions
Portuguese Possessions
Native States
THE M·N. WORKS

India has long been and still is the home of many peoples, differing greatly in race, language, religion, and civilization, from the dog-faced man-eaters of the Bay of Bengal to the highly cultivated and spiritual Brahmins. At the bottom of the scale are the miserable inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, living almost without clothes and shelter, and exhibiting few signs of intelligence. The various peoples of India

The Hindus form the most important portion of the population. They speak various dialects derived from the ancient Sanskrit, a language related to Greek and Latin. They penetrated into India in the remote past and drove the original inhabitants into the mountains or reduced them to servitude. The Hindus developed a noble literature, which is studied in the universities of western Europe, and their religious teachings find adherents to-day in England and America. It was they who appear to have invented the nine arithmetical figures and the cipher, which are now used throughout the civilized world. The Hindus

The Hindus are separated into rigid social classes or "castes," the highest being that of the Brahmins, or priests, a class which furnishes the poets, lawgivers, and scholars; the Rajputs or warriors come next; then the Vaisyas or husbandmen and merchants. Lowest of all are the Pariahs, who are not supposed to belong to any *caste* but are regarded as mere *outcasts* from society. Familiar association between those of different castes is regarded as sinful, and one can never escape from the group into which one is born. Besides the Hindus there are many Mohammedans who have swept into India from the north in wave after wave, adding to the general confusion of races and religions. The castes

A generation after Vasco da Gama landed in Calicut, a Mongolian conqueror, Baber,[1] had established his empire in

[1] Baber claimed to be descended from an earlier invader, the famous Timur (or Tamerlane), who died in 1405. The so-called Mongol (or Mogul) emperors were really Turkish rather than Mongolian in origin. A very interesting account of them and their enlightenment may be found in Holden, *The Mogul Emperors of Hindustan.*

The Mongolian emperors of Hindustan

India. The dynasty of Mongolian rulers which he founded had been able to keep the whole country under its control for nearly two centuries; but in 1707 Aurangzeb, the last Mongolian emperor of importance, died. In his old age he saw that anarchy would come after he was gone and he wrote a sad letter to a friend in which he bemoaned a wasted life.[1]

Subahdars, nawabs, and rajahs

He was right in his forebodings, for his empire fell apart in much the same way as that of Charlemagne had done. Like the counts and dukes of the Carolingian period, the emperor's officials, the subahdars and nawabs (nabobs), and the rajahs—i.e. the Hindu princes temporarily subjugated by the Mongols—gradually got the power in their respective districts into their own hands. Although the emperor, or Great Mogul, as the English called him, continued to maintain himself in his capital of Delhi, he could no longer be said to rule the country at the opening of the eighteenth century when the French and English were seriously beginning to turn their attention to his coasts.

Dupleix plans to conquer India for France

The real situation in India had long been apparent to the French governors, and in 1741 when Dupleix, the most remarkable of them, received his appointment, he openly adopted the policy of establishing French power by allying himself with the native rulers and playing them off one against another. He strongly fortified the French capital, Pondicherry. He assumed princely titles granted him by the Great Mogul and introduced Oriental pomp into his processions and ceremonies. As he had but few soldiers, he enlisted great numbers of natives—a custom which was also quickly adopted on a large scale by the English. These native soldiers, whom the English called "sepoys," were taught to fight in the manner of the Europeans and, under the sterner discipline of western military rules, soon developed into capable soldiers, especially when supported by some European officers and privates.

The sepoys

[1] See *Readings*, sect. 18.

During the wars which raged in Europe over the realms of Maria Theresa, the French and English East India companies were also fighting to extend their power. One question at issue was whether the French or the English candidate should become nawab of the Carnatic. Dupleix appeared at first to have the advantage over the English, but his magnificent plan of creating a vast French colonial empire in India was frustrated by an English commander of even greater genius than his. This was Robert Clive, who had become a clerk in the service of the English company at Madras in 1744. He had discovered that the sword was more to his taste than the quill of the bookkeeper and had taken service in the army when hostilities with the French broke out. His skill in organizing the native troops was such that Dupleix was unable to maintain his reputation and was recalled to France in disgrace in 1754.

Dupleix fights the English

Robert Clive

The final crisis in India came in 1756 when France, casting in her fortunes with Austria, was forced to wage war at one and the same time with Prussia on land and England on the sea. The French government dispatched Count Lally to India with a large force for the purpose of destroying the English settlements along the Madras coast. Though for a time successful, he was finally beaten and his fleet disorganized and driven away, so that the French land forces were not supported from the sea as were the English. Count Lally was hopelessly defeated at the decisive battle of Wandewash in 1760 and fell back to Pondicherry where, blockaded by land and sea, he was compelled the next year to surrender the French capital in India. The dream cherished by Dupleix was now dispelled and never again were the French seriously to menace the rising power of England in India.

The Seven Years' War in India

Battle of Wandewash, 1760

The treaty of Paris of 1763, which brought the Seven Years' War to a close, returned Pondicherry to France, as well as the other posts which she had held prior to Dupleix's territorial gains, but these posts were not to be fortified and French troops could not be stationed in Bengal, the seat of the growing

End of French political power in India

power of England. France ceased to be a rival in the contest for the possession of the peninsula and the English were left free scope in the work of conquering and ruling India.[1]

Clive and Surajah Dowlah

While the troops of the English East India Company under their able commander, Clive, were successfully fighting the French under Lally, they were also beginning the conquest of Bengal. This important province on the Ganges was under one of the Great Mogul's nawabs, or viceroys, whose seat of government was at Moorshedabad, about a hundred miles north of Calcutta. With the decline of the Mogul's power, the nawab had become practically independent. Now the English, in their anxiety to get the better of their French enemies, had taken the liberty of fortifying their posts in the nawab's possessions without obtaining his consent. This gave offense to the new nawab, Surajah Dowlah, a headstrong young fellow who had just come into power. The English further irritated him by giving shelter to his relatives, who were fleeing from his wrath.

The "Black Hole of Calcutta"

Surajah Dowlah thereupon marched upon Calcutta, seized some of the property of the company, and shut up one hundred and forty-five Englishmen in a little room about eighteen feet square, with only two small windows. Whether the nawab had really intended to destroy the unfortunate prisoners or not, only twenty-three of them staggered out of the dungeon when the door was opened the following morning. This tragedy of the "Black Hole of Calcutta," as it was called, raised a cry for revenge on the part of the English and a call for help was immediately sent to Madras, where Clive was stationed with some troops.[2]

Clive wins the battle of Plassey, 1757

In response to this call, Clive hastened at once to Bengal by sea and, by show of force, compelled Surajah Dowlah to restore the English prisoners and make compensation for the

[1] The French still have ten posts in India aggregating about two hundred square miles, with the old town of Pondicherry as their capital. The colony has a governor and is represented in the French Parliament by a senator and one deputy.

[2] See *Readings*, sect. 18.

injuries he had inflicted. Not content with this achievement, Clive seized the French settlement at Chandarnagar in the nawab's dominions, whereupon Surajah Dowlah allied himself with the French against the English. The quarrel was finally decided at the battle of Plassey where Clive, with about nine hundred English soldiers and two thousand sepoys, defeated the nawab's force of nearly fifty thousand natives aided by a few French.

English control established in Bengal

After the great victory of Plassey, Surajah Dowlah was deposed and murdered and Clive's nominee was proclaimed nawab on condition of rewarding his English friends with enormous gifts from Surajah Dowlah's treasury. The new nawab proved unsatisfactory however, despite his liberality, and he was deposed in favor of another nominee of the English who, to their surprise, showed such independence when he got into power that they were forced to make war upon him in order to reduce him to submission. Like the war with Surajah Dowlah, this new conflict turned out in favor of the English in spite of the fact that the Great Mogul came to the aid of his nominal vassal. At the battle of Buxar, the Mogul himself was captured and compelled to grant to the company the right to administer his imperial revenues in Bengal. This meant that, for all practical purposes, the victors became governors of this vast region, though a nominal nawab was retained in office.

Corruption among the agents of the East India Company

Thus by a series of unexpected events, a trading company was transformed into a great governing body supporting thousands of soldiers, waging war, making treaties, acquiring territory, administering a portion of the Great Mogul's finances, and enjoying immense revenues from taxes and trading monopolies. Exceptional advantages for enriching themselves were now offered to the agents of the company in India because the directors, ten thousand miles away, could exercise very little control over officials, traders, and agents in a strange land with no strong government to keep the foreigners in order.

The English government begins to control the East India Company

Huge fortunes were consequently accumulated rapidly through corruption and by exploiting the defenseless natives; penniless young men who had gone out in the service of the company returned to England in ten or twelve years in the possession of such wealth as to excite the astonishment of the English people at home.[1] Clive himself was poor when he first entered the employ of the company, but at the age of thirty-four he enjoyed an income of forty thousand pounds a year and yet regarded himself as moderate in his accumulations. He frankly declared that the evil of corruption was contagious in India and that it had spread among the civil and military employees down to the lowest rank.

Strange as it may seem, in spite of its remarkable achievements and the trading advantages it had won, the East India Company was sadly in debt and was confronted by the most difficult problems in managing its unwieldy undertakings. This state of affairs, coupled with the conduct of the company's agents in India and the news of a terrible famine in Bengal in 1770, which destroyed nearly one half of the population, called the attention of the British government to the necessity of exercising a stricter supervision over the English enterprises in India. Parliament thereupon vested the control of Bombay and Madras in the hands of a governor and four councilors in Bengal, to be appointed by Parliament in the first instance, and by the directors of the East India Company thereafter, but always subject to the approval of the crown. The measure also provided that all reports sent to London by the company's agents should be open to inspection by the British government.

Warren Hastings governor general of India in 1774

The English possessions were surrounded by the domains of native rulers, great and small, who had ordinarily risen to power through military prowess and were liable to sudden and violent overthrow. The peninsula was thus kept in a constant

[1] Those who returned from India to spend their ill-gotten gains in London were popularly known as "nabobs." They often figure in Thackeray's novels.

state of turmoil and there could be no hope of peace until some one power suppressed the petty rulers. Warren Hastings became governor general of India in 1774. For various reasons, for which he was not always responsible, his administration was filled with military conflicts with the natives, although the company was not intent on extending its possessions. Serious accusations of cruelty and misgovernment were brought against him, and on his return to England in 1788 he was impeached by the House of Commons, the charges being presented in a long and impassioned speech by the celebrated orator, Burke.[1] This famous trial dragged on for seven years and finally ended in the acquittal of Hastings.

Impeachment of Hastings

The extensive wars in which the company was engaged during Hastings's administration led Parliament in 1784 to assume a more direct management of Indian affairs. A board appointed by the king was to reside in England, supervise the civil, military, and financial transactions of the company and examine their accounts and reports. In matters pertaining to the expenditure of revenue, to diplomacy, peace and war, power was vested in the governor general and three advisers appointed by the company with the king's approval and liable to be dismissed by him at will. This meant that the highest authority in India was thereafter to be in the hands of officials whose choice was practically determined by Parliament.[2]

Parliament controls the British government in India after 1784

Although, in assuming control of the political affairs of the company, Parliament distinctly repudiated any intention of making further conquests in India, the governor generals who

Increase of British possessions in India

[1] Later writers defend Hastings against the charges advanced by Burke, and seem to agree that only his heroic measures could have saved India for the English. See Lyall, *Warren Hastings*, in English Men of Action Series.

[2] The first of the governors under the new arrangement was Lord Cornwallis, who retrieved in war and government in India the reputation he had lost in the unhappy conflict with the American colonies. The third governor general, Lord Wellesley, with the assistance of his more famous brother, later Duke of Wellington, carried forward the policy which Cornwallis and his predecessors had found unavoidable, and steadily annexed new territories whose rulers had disturbed the English rule. See below, chap. xxvii.

were sent out found themselves irresistibly drawn into wars by the restlessness of native rulers whose domains bordered on the English possessions. By 1805 the British dominion had been extended far up the Ganges valley, southward along the eastern coast, and over a great portion of the southern end of the peninsula.

REFERENCES

The Mohammedan Empire in India: HUNTER, *A Brief History of the Indian Peoples*, pp. 132–155; LYALL, *Rise of British Dominion in India*, pp. 32–37, 50–53.

Early Rivalry for the Indian Trade: LYALL, pp. 1–23; HUNTER, pp. 164–175.

Dupleix and French Dominion in India: LYALL, pp. 59–84; PERKINS, *France under Louis XV*, Vol. I, pp. 379–430.

The Seven Years' War in India: LYALL, pp. 85–97; PERKINS, Vol. I, pp. 431–453.

Clive and English Conquests in Bengal: LYALL, pp. 98–111, 130–136; HUNTER, pp. 176–186; COLBY, *Selections from the Sources of English History*, pp. 245–247; WILSON, *Clive* (English Men of Action Series).

Warren Hastings as Governor General: LYALL, pp. 157–178; HUNTER, pp. 186–190; LYALL, *Warren Hastings* (English Men of Action Series).

CHAPTER VII

THE RIVALRY OF FRANCE AND ENGLAND IN NORTH AMERICA

How the European Nations established themselves in the New World

19. While the Portuguese, Dutch, English, and French merchants and trading companies were busy in India and the Spice Islands establishing trading posts, fighting one another, and gradually conquering territory, a new world on the other side of the globe was being opened up which was to exercise a great influence upon European affairs. We must now turn to the discovery and settlement of the western hemisphere.

The earth known during the Middle Ages to be a globe

All through the Middle Ages scholars had known that the earth was a globe although, like the ancient geographers, they somewhat underrated its size, and supposed it to be about one sixth smaller than it is. It was inevitable therefore that, just when the Portuguese navigators were creeping gradually down the African coast with the expectation of getting around it and reaching the Orient by sea, it should have occurred to other adventurous mariners to try to reach Asia and the Spice Islands by sailing westward. This plan seemed the more promising since Marco Polo and other travelers had given an exaggerated idea of the distance which they had traveled eastward, and it was supposed that it could not be a very long journey from Europe across the Atlantic to Japan.

Columbus discovers America, 1492

In the year 1492, as we all know, a Genoese navigator, Columbus, who had had much experience on the sea, got together three little ships and undertook the journey westward to Zipango, or Japan, which he hoped to reach in five

weeks. Thirty-six days from the time he left the Canary Islands he came upon land, the island of San Salvador, and believed himself to be in the East Indies. Going on from there he discovered the island of Cuba, which he believed to be the mainland of Asia, and then Haiti, which he mistook for the longed-for Zipango. Although he made three later expeditions and sailed down the coast of South America as far as the Orinoco, he died without realizing that he had not been exploring the coast of Asia. Columbus had been supplied by the Spanish queen, Isabella, with the money necessary to carry out his undertaking and consequently the new-found islands and the adjacent mainland were claimed by Spain.

Cabral happens upon Brazil in 1500

While Columbus and others were exploring the Caribbean Sea in the interests of Spain, Cabral, a Portuguese commander on his way around Africa to India, sailed so far west that he came upon Brazil. Thereupon the coast southward was rapidly investigated by the Portuguese, who in this way came into possession of a vast region in the New World.

The Spanish hope to reach the Pacific

Strange as it may seem, the brilliant exploits of Columbus were at first disappointing to the Spaniards, for the islands of the West Indies yielded a poor return for the outlay necessitated by the various expeditions. The Portuguese, on the other hand, were deriving fabulous sums from the Eastern trade, and the Spaniards therefore determined to find a western route to India. They at once began an energetic search for a passage which would open into the waters of the Pacific and it was this motive, together with their natural taste for exploration and adventure, that led to the foundation of their power on the mainland.

The Spanish cross the Isthmus of Panama

In 1508 Pinzon set out on a voyage to discover what lay beyond the islands which Columbus had found, and, sailing across the Gulf of Mexico, he skirted along the coast of Central and South America. Five years later the spirited Balboa with a small troop pushed his way through the jungles and swamps of the Isthmus of Panama, and, on the morning of

September 25, 1513, saw from the mountain heights the waters of the Pacific. After prostrating himself upon the earth, he raised himself to his knees and "poured forth his boundless gratitude to God and all the heavenly hosts who had reserved the prize of so great a thing unto him, a man of small wit and knowledge, of little experience, and lowly parentage."

The earth is first circumnavigated, 1519–1522

It remained for Magellan, a Portuguese who had deserted to Spain, to find his way down the barren and seemingly interminable coast of Patagonia, reach the straits which bear his name, and thus penetrate into the Pacific. This he crossed and reached the Philippine Islands after accomplishing the greatest feat of continuous seamanship that the world has ever known. Here he was killed by a native, but his vessel, the Victoria, reached home in 1522. This first voyage ever made around the globe required very nearly three years.

The ancient inhabitants of Mexico

From Cuba the Spaniards found their way into Mexico, which was inhabited by a people that had made some beginnings in civilization. They lived in *pueblos*, or towns, cultivated the soil, and exhibited great skill in working up gold and silver into utensils and ornaments of which they had stored up vast quantities. But they had a rule that they must fight their neighbors at least once every twenty days in order to obtain victims for sacrifice and for their cannibal feasts. Human sacrifice they believed essential in order to support the sun, which would otherwise perish.

Cortes conquers Mexico in 1521, and Pizarro conquers Peru in 1532

In 1521 Cortes captured the city of Mexico and began the conquest of New Spain, as he called the region, — a tract eight hundred miles in length and extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean. The chief object in conquering this territory was the great supply of gold and silver articles which the natives had been accumulating for centuries, and which were sent to Spain to be recast into coin. Before long, rumors reached the Spaniards of untold wealth among the Incas of Peru, and ten years after Cortes had won Mexico, Pizarro, with a company of one hundred and eighty-three

soldiers, invaded and cruelly subjugated the land. He and his followers gratified their thirst for gold by plundering the burial places where the gold and silver articles which had belonged to the dead were deposited with them.[1]

After the conquest of Peru, Spain's stream of treasure from the New World was trebled; the silver mines of Europe were abandoned, and soon all the gold supply also was derived from America. It is no wonder that English, French, and other mariners found excuses for capturing Spanish galleons, and by piracy and smuggling strove to share in the advantages which Spain enjoyed in the West Indies.

The Spaniards lose interest in North America after the failure of De Soto's expedition, 1542

The Spaniards naturally sent expeditions to explore what are now the southernmost of the United States. After Pizarro had conquered Peru, one of his lieutenants, De Soto, traversed this region in search of gold and silver such as had been found in Mexico and Peru. He struggled through forests and swamps for four years, finding only an Indian village here and there, and at last reached the Mississippi, where he died, leaving his disheartened followers to make their way back to Mexico. After this, Spain lost interest in North America and left it, with the exception of Mexico and Florida, to be fought over by other European powers, especially France and England.[2]

Spain occupies the Philippine Archipelago, 1565

Spain, however, pressed on westward where Magellan had shown the way. Forty-four years after he had laid claim in her name to the archipelago which he had discovered far to

[1] The Spanish built churches and made every effort to convert the natives to Christianity. "The aboriginal population, freed from the grinding tyranny of their old masters, increased and throve; new mines, especially of silver, were discovered and wrought. Both Peru and Mexico assumed gradually the semblance of civilized life; and their prosperity testified to the benefits conferred on them by conquests which, however unjustifiable upon abstract grounds, in both cases redeemed the populations affected by them from cruel and oppressive [native] governments, and bloody and senseless religions." — E. J. Payne in *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. I, chaps. i–ii. This rosy view of the Spanish conquest deserves respectful consideration, since it is that of an eminent scholar; but it should be said that earlier historians reached entirely opposite conclusions and accuse the Spaniards of practically exterminating the natives by their cruelty.

[2] Spain, however, founded, to the north of her main possessions, St. Augustine in 1565, and Santa Fe (New Mexico) in 1598.

the south of Japan, an expedition of soldiers and friars was sent out from New Spain (Mexico) to occupy the islands. These they discovered to be "large and rich, well provided with inhabitants, food, and gold." The group had earlier been named the Philippine Islands after Philip II, who was then heir to the Spanish throne. In 1571 a well-sheltered bay was discovered upon the west shore of the island of Luzon, and there the town of Manila was established and made the seat of the Spanish government in the islands.

Development by Spain of the Philippines

The archipelago consists of seventeen or eighteen hundred islands, large and small, inhabited by three distinct races which are divided into many tribes differing from one another both in language and civilization. The Spaniards were early defeated by the Sultan of Sulu and never gained complete control over the more savage tribes, especially the Moros, who still cling to Mohammedanism. The friars and Jesuits, however, Christianized a great part of the islands, and the natural products, such as hemp, tobacco, coffee, sugar, and rice, were developed.

How Spain ruled and converted the natives

It was the policy of Spain to keep a firm hold on her possessions in the New World, and for three centuries she ruled the subjugated natives by means of viceroys. As the conversion of the heathen was always regarded as important by the Spaniards, friars followed the explorers, establishing missions from Chile to California,[1] and in 1600 there were four hundred monasteries in New Spain alone. The Spaniards did not emigrate in great numbers but, by the close of the eighteenth century, there were in all the colonies probably some three or four millions of them whose blood was unmixed with that of the native races, beside many half-breeds.

England, although she was later to be so great an influence in the New World, allowed a hundred years or more to elapse

[1] The mission monasteries in California (especially that which may still be seen at Santa Barbara) have exercised a very happy influence upon the architecture of the region.

John Cabot and other English seamen search for the northwest passage

after its discovery before her mariners did much more than hunt in vain for a western passage to India and plunder such Spanish ships as they might encounter. In 1497 John Cabot, an Italian by birth, sailed from Bristol westward with the hope of reaching "the island of Zipango and the lands from which Oriental caravans brought their goods to Alexandria." But he found only the barren coast of Labrador, which he believed to be a part of Asia. For at least a century and a half thereafter so little was known of North America that mariners continued to search for a convenient passage westward to the Pacific and the Spice Islands.

Drake's expedition, 1577–1580

Under Elizabeth there was an outburst of maritime enthusiasm. The adventures of Sir Francis Drake afford an example of the way in which the English raided the Spanish posts. Setting sail from Plymouth in November, 1577, with five vessels and one hundred and sixty-four men, he passed the Straits of Magellan, in August, and then turned northward, following the west coast to Santiago in Chile, where he rifled the chapel, carrying off a "silver chalice, two cruets, and one altar cloth"; and, from a Spanish vessel which they seized near there, his men got upwards of thirty-seven thousand ducats of pure gold. Later they plundered three barks, taking from them fifty-seven wedges of silver, each weighing twenty pounds. Near Panama they captured a Spanish vessel from which they took "great riches, such as precious stones, thirteen chests full of reals of plate, fourscore pound weight of gold, and six and twenty tons of silver." Drake then sailed northward along the coast of North America and, turning westward across the Pacific, reached Borneo on February 8, 1580, and England, by way of the Cape of Good Hope, in November of the same year. Drake was only one of the many English seamen engaged in capturing the treasure ships of the hated Philip II, but the first two or three attempts of the English to establish colonies in North America failed; nor were the efforts of the French before 1600 more successful.


EXPLORATIONS AND COLONIES
OF THE 15TH, 16TH, AND 17TH CENTURIES
BRITISH
FRENCH
DANISH
SPANISH
PORTUGUESE
DUTCH
British and French Rival Claims
ENGLAND
FRANCE
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
NETHERLANDS
SCOTLAND
IRELAND
NORWAY
Greenland
Iceland
Tropic of Cancer
Tropic of Capricorn
Equator
Longitude 60 West from Greenwich 30
Longitude 60 East from Greenwich

Verrazano, an Italian commander in the French service, had captured two of the treasure ships dispatched by Cortes to Spain in 1522 and turned them over to the French king, Francis I, who was so impressed by the riches which were flowing into Spain that he commissioned Verrazano to explore the shore from Florida to Newfoundland and to search for a northwest passage to the East Indies. Upon this exploration, France based her claim to North America, which she named New France. Ten years later another Frenchman, Jacques Cartier, made his way up the St. Lawrence River and took possession of the land in the name of his sovereign. He even made an unsuccessful attempt to found a colony on the present site of Montreal.

Verrazano (1524) and Cartier (1534) claim North America for France

A company having been formed in France for colonizing Acadia (as Nova Scotia was then called) and Canada, a group of Frenchmen succeeded in 1604 in establishing a permanent settlement in Acadia at Port Royal and four years later the famous Champlain, "the father of New France," as he has been fittingly called, founded a settlement at Quebec. With this as a basis the French explorers, traders, and missionaries worked their way westward and southward, the long reaches of navigable waters and the rich fur trade luring them farther and farther inland. Champlain, like Livingstone, was at once a missionary and an ardent explorer. He discovered (1609) the beautiful lake which bears his name and wrote a number of books which served to make the great virgin forests and their savage inhabitants known to his countrymen.

The French establish themselves at Port Royal and Quebec, 1604–1608

Champlain

Montreal was permanently founded in 1642, a generation later than Quebec, and the French companies offered every inducement to settlers who would agree to go to Canada; but the severe climate and the hard life deterred all except the more adventurous, and when Louis XIV came to the throne there were not more than three thousand of his subjects dwelling in the valley of the St. Lawrence. The French explorers and missionaries pressed westward in the hope of finding the

The French in Canada

Pacific. They discovered the Great Lakes, raised a cross at Sault Ste. Marie and, in the name of Louis XIV, laid claim to all the lands about the lakes, discovered or undiscovered, "bounded on the one side by the seas of the north and of the west, and on the other by the South Sea."

How Marquette explored the Mississippi, 1673

Rumors began to reach the French explorers of a mighty river flowing across the continent which might enable them at last to reach the Pacific. In 1673, under the guidance of friendly Indians, Marquette, a Jesuit missionary, and Joliet, a veteran explorer and trader, reached the upper Mississippi. Father Marquette gives a fascinating account of their experiences. Undeterred by the warnings of the Indians, who declared that the river was full of monsters which would devour them and their canoes, and lined with savage peoples who would kill them without mercy, Marquette and his companions committed themselves to the stream and for days floated down with its current, stopping to smoke a pipe with the Illinois Indians, observing the buffaloes on the banks and noting the muddy Missouri River as they passed the site of St. Louis. They finally satisfied themselves, as they approached the Gulf of Mexico, that "the Mississippi discharged itself into it and not to the eastward of the Cape of Florida or westward into the California Sea." Fearful lest they should meet the Spanish they turned back.[1]

La Salle claims Louisiana for France, 1682

Their work was completed by La Salle, a determined and experienced explorer, who had already discovered the Ohio River. Encouraged by Louis XIV, he set out from Lake Michigan in January, 1682, with a band of twenty-three Frenchmen and eighteen Indians, all inured to hardship. After passing down the Illinois River and the Mississippi, whose mouth they reached in April, La Salle solemnly took possession of all the region watered by the great river and its tributaries and named it Louisiana after his king. His later attempt to colonize the country was, however, a failure.

[1] See *Readings*, sect. 19, for Marquette's story.

The English found Jamestown, 1607

While the French were roaming about the Great Lakes and the Mississippi Valley, the English were slowly occupying the Atlantic coast from New England to Florida. A year before Champlain founded Quebec, Englishmen had established their first successful colony, which they had named Jamestown after their king, James I. After a period of deprivation and suffering, the colonists began to find their way inland and take possession of the fertile valleys of Virginia. Under Charles II North and South Carolina were colonized.

The New England colonies

The New England colonists differed essentially from those of Virginia. In 1620 the *Mayflower* had landed at Plymouth bringing stern, religious Englishmen, who could not endure the ceremonies of the English church as it had been organized under Elizabeth[1] and had fled to the New World to found permanent homes where they might worship as they pleased. Nine years later the Massachusetts Bay Company began to attract thousands of well-to-do Puritans, whose worldly prosperity contributed not a little to the success of the colony. Off-shoots of this colony established themselves in Connecticut and Rhode Island. The climate and the soil of New England did not encourage the use of slave labor, which became the bane of the southern colonies. The northern colonists, instead of scattering upon great plantations, kept together and formed compact settlements, which tended to develop a spirit of independence and well-organized governments.

Brief rôle of the Dutch in North America

Henry Hudson, an English mariner sailing under the Dutch flag, had discovered (1609) the river which bears his name and the island of Manhattan at its mouth. On this island the Dutch West India Company established its colony of New Amsterdam and the Dutch occupied the valley of the Hudson and what is now New Jersey under the name of the New Netherlands. But the short history of the Dutch in North America came to an end in 1664, when their possessions were conquered by the English.

[1] See below, p. 150.

Pennsylvania and Maryland

Maryland became the refuge for persecuted Roman Catholics. Pennsylvania, granted to William Penn by Charles II in 1681, developed into a thriving colony of Quakers, whose simple habits and opposition to war had made them hated in England.

England gains Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and the Hudson Bay region

Many changes took place in the various companies which received grants and established colonies in the New World; there was much fighting with the Indians and constant uncertainty and disputes in regard to boundaries. The wars in Europe, moreover, were usually accompanied by little wars among the colonists of the various nations involved. Into these matters we need not go. During the War of the Spanish Succession (called Queen Anne's War by the colonists), the New England settlers had captured the French stronghold of Port Royal[1] in Nova Scotia (then Acadia). This was important for them on account of the cod which their fishermen caught every year on the neighboring Newfoundland banks. By the Peace of Utrecht at the end of the war, France ceded Nova Scotia to England and acknowledged her right to Newfoundland and the region about Hudson Bay which had been in dispute between the two countries.[2]

Georgia, and its troubles with the neighboring Spaniards

In the South a new English colony called Georgia had been established by Oglethorpe, and the town of Savannah founded in 1733 very near the Spanish boundary of Florida. When England went to war with Spain in 1739, Oglethorpe organized a little army of the colonists in Georgia and South Carolina and laid siege to the Spanish fortress of St. Augustine, but sickness in his army forced him to give up his attempt to take the town.

The map of the New World in 1750 indicates that it was divided up as follows among the various European countries which had participated in its exploration and colonization

[1] Now Annapolis.

[2] The English had organized a Hudson Bay Company in 1670, and laid claim to the vast region north of New France.

ENGLAND
FRANCE AND SPAIN
IN AMERICA
1750
0 100 200 300 400 500 1000
Scale of Miles
THE M-N. WORKS
Baffin Bay
GREENLAND
Hudson Bay
RUPERT'S LAND
HUDSON BAY
Winnipeg
Lake of the Woods
Nelson R.
Saskatchewan R.
Albany R.
Rupert R.
Moose R.
Gt. Whale R.
Nasko R.
Labrador
NEWFOUNDLAND
Cape Breton I.
Halifax
Port Royal (1608)
St. Lawrence R.
Montreal
Quebec
Mississippi R.
Missouri R.
CANADA OR NEW FRANCE
Detroit
Ft. Duquesne
Philadelphia
Albany
Hartford
Boston
Plymouth
Providence
New York
Baltimore
Jamestown (1607)
Wilmington
Bermuda Is.
Vincennes
Kaskaskia
Ohio R.
Arkansas R.
Red R.
LOUISIANA
Santa Fe (1598)
Colorado R.
Charleston
Savannah (1733)
Pensacola
New Orleans (1718)
St. Augustine (1565)
Bahamas
GULF OF MEXICO
Tropic of Cancer
Havana
CUBA
JAMAICA
HAITI
San Domingo
PORTO RICO
CARIBBEAN SEA
Mexico
NEW SPAIN
BELIZE
GUATEMALA
PACIFIC OCEAN
ATLANTIC OCEAN
SOUTH AMERICA
Equator
PERU
140 130 120 110 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0

during the two centuries and a half that they had known of its existence. Besides New France (Canada), the French held Louisiana, extending from the Alleghenies to the Rocky Mountains and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. This was defended by scattered forts, extending from New Orleans (founded by the French Mississippi Company in 1718) to Montreal. France also held a portion of the island of Haiti and of Guiana (Cayenne) on the northeastern coast of South America. The English Hudson Bay Company claimed the great ill-explored region, frequented by adventurous trappers, which lay to the north of New France. English colonies occupied all the Atlantic coast from Newfoundland to a point south of Savannah. England had settlements besides in the Bahamas, Jamaica, and Belize (British Honduras). She had also, like France, colonized a portion of Guiana on the coast of South America, but this she ceded to the Dutch in 1667 in exchange for New Amsterdam and their other North American possessions. In general, however, all the region to the south of Santa Fe and St. Augustine, including Mexico, Florida, Central America, the West Indies, and all of South America, except Brazil (which was Portuguese) and Guiana, belonged to the Spanish crown. All the outlying regions, such as the northwestern parts of North America, the interior of Brazil, and the southern part of South America, were little known or entirely unexplored.

How the New World was apportioned in 1750 among the European powers — England, France, Spain, Holland, and Portugal

Struggle between France and England for North America

20. In the final struggle which was approaching between France and England for the possession of North America, the French found themselves at a great disadvantage. Their claims included an immense territory upon which, in the nature of things, they could have only a very precarious hold. The exhausting wars of Louis XIV affected the colonies by checking immigration and preventing their proper financial

Weakness of the French colonies

support by the home government. The Huguenots, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, would gladly have found homes in the New World and built up the French power as the Puritans had the English. But New France and Louisiana had been explored by the Jesuits, and both the home government and the priests scattered about North America stoutly opposed the coming of the heretical Huguenots, who were therefore forced to flee to Protestant countries in search of freedom.

Scarcely a hundred thousand French colonists in 1754

The French who came to America were, in general, too engrossed in the fur trade, in exploring, in converting the Indians to Christianity, or in fighting the English colonists, to form strong settled communities. They were not permitted to govern themselves when they did collect in settlements, but were carefully watched by the officials of a king who forbade them to trade with any one except Frenchmen and Indians. As a result of these conditions the scattered French population of North America was less than a hundred thousand souls when the war broke out with England in 1754.

Strength of the English colonies

The situation of the English colonies from Massachusetts to Georgia was quite different. They varied greatly, it is true, in population, religion, trade, and industry, but they had much in common and could combine far more easily than the French. Four fifths of the English lived within a short distance of the seacoast and were consequently in ready communication with the mother country compared with a Frenchman in Kaskaskia or Detroit, or even in New Orleans. Each of the colonies had its own government and its representative assembly which voted taxes and passed laws subject to the approval of the king.

Character and number of the English colonists

Moreover the English settlers were, for the most part, seeking permanent homes for themselves and their families; there were few mere traders, trappers, missionaries, or wandering adventurers. In spite of the rule made by Parliament that they must trade only with England, industry and commerce

increased, for it was always possible to evade the navigation laws, which were not strictly enforced. The population of the English colonies increased very rapidly. By the close of the War of the Spanish Succession there must have been toward half a million, and by 1750 this number had almost trebled. A great part of the colonists at this latter date had been born in America, but they were still loyal to their English king, and were now able to vote money, men, and ships to aid him in his wars.

The English colonists press westward and meet the French

As the English colonies grew they gradually pressed inland and so inevitably came into conflict with the French, who claimed all the region south of the Great Lakes. The New England population expanded toward the St. Lawrence, that of New York and Virginia westward toward Lake Erie and into what is now Ohio. In 1749 the Ohio Company was formed by London merchants and leading Virginians with a view of forwarding colonization beyond the Alleghenies. The French were alarmed, established a fort at Erie, and prepared to defend, as the boundary between them and the English, a line which would to-day lie within the limits of western Pennsylvania.

Opening of the French and Indian War, 1754

Virginia now raised a little army of four hundred men which set out under George Washington to protect a fort that the Ohio Company was building where Pittsburg now stands. The French, with their allies the Indians, reached the spot first, captured the fort, which they named Fort Duquesne, and compelled Washington to surrender on condition that he and his men should be permitted to return to Virginia. In this way the French and Indian War originated, quite independently of any trouble between England and France, which were then at peace.

It was clear that a struggle was not to be avoided, and both France and England began to send forces to America. The English colonies even considered a plan of federation (which for the moment came to nothing) and collected troops to fight

side by side with the forces sent from England. Of the English troops, which amounted in 1758 to about fifty thousand, more than half were supplied by the colonies. An expedition was sent to Nova Scotia from Boston with a view of completing the conquest of a region which had been already in part ceded to England. The English commander, General Braddock, tried to recapture Fort Duquesne but, failing to heed the warnings of Washington, he was defeated by the French and Indians and killed (1755).

The English successes

In 1756 the Seven Years' War opened and England, as the ally of Frederick the Great, went to war against France and Austria.[1] In America the French troops were under the able command of Montcalm, who was supported by all the Indians in the disputed region. For a time the English were kept out of the mooted territory, but when William Pitt was put at the head of the English government in 1757 all was changed. He not only aided the hard-pressed Frederick with men and money in the European war but sent out reënforcements to the American colonists which enabled them to take Louisburg on Cape Breton Island, capture Fort Duquesne (which they renamed after Pitt), and drive the French out of western New York.

The French lose Canada, 1759–1760

The following year the English were able to begin the conquest of Canada. They took Ticonderoga and Crown Point on Lake Champlain, and Fort Niagara. Then, from the recently captured Louisburg, the English under General Wolfe made their way up the St. Lawrence to attack Quebec, the key to the French power in Canada, which was defended by Montcalm. After an unsuccessful siege of three months, Wolfe's troops one night scaled the heights upon which the town stands and next day defeated the French who had come out to meet him. Both Montcalm and Wolfe were killed in this memorable engagement. From this time on the conquest of Canada progressed rapidly. The French forts surrendered

[1] See above, p. 69.



Atlantic Coast

in quick succession and when Montreal was captured (1760), the French gave up the unequal conquest and recalled their troops.

Strength of the English colonies at the end of the war

Just before the close of the Seven Years' War Spain entered the conflict in America as an ally of France, and this gave the English an excuse for organizing an expedition which succeeded in taking Havana. The colonists, who eagerly attacked the Spanish merchantmen on the seas, were now able to outnumber in vessels, guns, and men the whole navy that England had possessed when the English colonies had first been established a century and a half earlier.

By the Peace of Paris (1763) the French possessions in North America were ceded to England and Spain

In the Peace of Paris (1763), which brought the Seven Years' War to a close, France gave up all her territory in North America. That to the east of the Mississippi she ceded to England; that to the west of the river, including the city of New Orleans, she gave to her ally Spain. Spain, on her part, ceded Florida to England on condition that England would restore to her Havana and Manila, both of which the English had captured. In this way England got possession of practically all that part of North America which had as yet been explored and developed, with the exception, of course, of Mexico. While Spain's territory was greatly augmented by Louisiana she was not in a position to colonize the region which, so to speak, lay fallow until, forty years later, it was purchased by the United States.

Traces of the French occupation

The only remnants of the French occupation of North America to-day are the French-speaking Creoles of New Orleans and the French Canadians in and about Quebec and Montreal. We still retain the name "prairie" which the French explorers gave to the grassy plains of Illinois. Names like Detroit, Vincennes, Terre Haute, Des Moines, and Baton Rouge still remind us of the nationality of the first explorers and missionaries, and it is pleasant to think that Joliet, La Salle, and Marquette each has a town dedicated to his memory although no word of his language be spoken there.

Revolt of the American Colonies from England

21. England had, however, no sooner added Canada to her possessions and driven the French from the broad region which lay between her colonies and the Mississippi than she lost the better part of her American empire by the revolt of the irritated colonists, who refused to submit to her interference in their government and commerce.

For a long period England left her colonies very free

The English settlers had been left alone, for the most part, by the home government and had enjoyed far greater freedom in the management of their affairs than the French and Spanish colonies. Virginia established its own assembly in 1619 and Massachusetts became almost an independent commonwealth. Regular constitutions developed which were later used as the basis for those of the several states when the colonies gained their independence. England had been busied during the seventeenth century with a great struggle at home and with the wars stirred up by Louis XIV. After the Peace of Utrecht Walpole for twenty years prudently refused to interfere with the colonies. The result was that by the end of the Seven Years' War the colonists numbered over two millions. Their rapidly increasing wealth and strength, their free life in a new land, and the confidence they had gained in their successful conflict with the French, — all combined to render the renewed interference of the home government intolerable to them.

England taxes the colonies

During the war with the French England began to realize for the first time that the colonies had money, and so Parliament decided that they should be required to pay part of the expenses of the recent conflict and support a small standing army of English soldiers. The Stamp Act was therefore passed, which taxed the colonists by requiring them to pay the English government for stamps which had to be used upon leases, deeds, and other legal documents in order to make them binding. But the indignant colonists declared that they had already

Stamp Act of 1765

borne the brunt of the war and that in any case Parliament, in which they were not represented, had no right to tax them. Representatives of the colonies met in New York and denounced the Stamp Act as indicating "a manifest tendency to subvert the rights and liberties of the colonists."

Navigation laws

More irritating than the attempts of Great Britain to tax the colonists were the vexatious navigation and trade laws by which she tried to keep all the benefits of colonial trade and industry to herself. The early navigation laws passed under Cromwell and Charles II were specially directed against the Dutch and have already been mentioned in connection with the rivalry of England and Holland.[1] They provided that all products grown or manufactured in Asia, Africa, or America should be imported into England or her colonies only in English ships. Thus if a Dutch merchant vessel laden with cloves, cinnamon, teas, and silks from the Far East anchored in the harbor of New York, the inhabitants could not lawfully buy of the ship's master, no matter how much lower his prices were than those offered by English shippers. Furthermore, another act provided that no commodity of European production or manufacture should be imported into any of the colonies without being shipped through England and carried in ships built in England or the colonies. So if a colonial merchant wished to buy French wines or Dutch watches, he would have to order through English merchants. Again, if a colonist desired to sell to a European merchant such products as the law permitted him to sell to foreigners, he had to export them in English ships and even send them by way of England.

Trade laws

What was still worse for the colonists, certain articles in which they were most interested, such as sugar, tobacco, cotton, and indigo, could be sold only in England. Other things they were forbidden to export at all, or even to produce. For instance, though they possessed the finest furs in abundance, they could not export any caps or hats to England or to any

[1] See above, p. 86.

foreign country. They had iron ore in inexhaustible quantities at their disposal, but by a law of 1750 they were forbidden to erect any rolling mill or furnace for making steel, in order that English steel manufacturers might enjoy a monopoly of that trade. The colonists had built up a lucrative lumber and provision trade with the French West Indies, from which they imported large quantities of rum, sugar, and molasses, but in order to keep this trade within British dominions the importation of these commodities was forbidden.

The colonists evade the English restrictions

The colonists naturally evaded these laws as far as possible; they carried on a flourishing smuggling trade and built up industries in spite of them. Tobacco, sugar, hemp, flax, and cotton were grown and cloth was manufactured. Furnaces, foundries, nail and wire mills supplied pig and bar iron, chains, anchors, and other hardware. It is clear that where so many people were interested in both manufacturing and commerce a loud protest was sure to be raised against the continued attempts of England to restrict the business of the colonists in the interests of her own merchants.

Taxes withdrawn except that on tea

Parliament withdrew the unpopular stamp tax, but declared that it had a perfect right to tax the colonies as well as to make laws for them. Soon new duties on glass, paper, and tea were imposed, and a board was established to secure a strict observance of the navigation laws and other restrictions. But the protests of the colonists finally moved Parliament to remove all the duties except that on tea, which was retained to prove England's right to tax the colonists.

Opposition to "taxation without representation"

This effort to make the Americans pay a very moderate import duty on tea produced further trouble in 1773. The young men of Boston seditiously boarded a tea ship in the harbor and threw the cargo into the water. Burke, perhaps the most able member of the House of Commons, urged the ministry to leave the Americans to tax themselves, but George III, and Parliament as a whole, could not forgive the colonists for their opposition. They believed that the trouble was largely

confined to New England and could easily be overcome. In 1774 acts were passed prohibiting the landing and shipping of goods at Boston; and the colony of Massachusetts was deprived of its former right to choose its judges and the members of the upper house of its legislature, who were thereafter to be selected by the king.

The Continental Congress

These measures, instead of bringing Massachusetts to terms, so roused the apprehension of the rest of the colonists that a congress of all the colonies was summoned which met at Philadelphia. This decided that all trade with Great Britain should cease until the grievances of the colonies had been redressed. The following year the Americans attacked the British troops at Lexington and made a brave stand against them in the battle of Bunker Hill. The new congress decided to prepare for war and raised an army which was put under the command of George Washington, a Virginia planter who had gained some distinction in the late French and Indian War. Up to this time the colonies had not intended to secede from the mother country, but the proposed compromises came to nothing, and in July, 1776, Congress declared that "these United States are, and of right ought to be, free and independent."

Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776

The United States seeks and receives aid from France

This occurrence naturally excited great interest in France. The outcome of the Seven Years' War had been most lamentable for that country, and any trouble which came to her old enemy, England, could not but be a source of congratulation to the French. The United States therefore regarded France as their natural ally and immediately sent Benjamin Franklin to Versailles in the hope of obtaining the aid of the new French king, Louis XVI. The king's ministers were uncertain whether the colonies could long maintain their resistance against the overwhelming strength of the mother country. It was only after the Americans had defeated Burgoyne at Saratoga that France, in 1778, concluded a treaty with the United States in which the independence of the new republic was recognized. This was tantamount to declaring war upon England.

The enthusiasm for the Americans was so great in France that a number of the younger nobles, the most conspicuous of whom was the Marquis of Lafayette, crossed the Atlantic to fight in the American army.

Close of the war, 1783

In spite of the skill and heroic self-sacrifice of Washington, the Americans lost more battles than they gained. It is extremely doubtful whether they would have succeeded in bringing the war to a favorable close, by forcing the English general, Cornwallis, to capitulate at Yorktown (1781), had it not been for the aid of the French fleet. The chief result of the war was the recognition by England of the independence of the United States, whose territory was to extend to the Mississippi River. To the west of the Mississippi, the vast territory of Louisiana still remained in the hands of Spain, as well as Florida, which England had held since 1763 but now gave back.

England acknowledges the independence of the United States

Revolt of the English colonies the beginning of the emancipation of the western hemisphere

Spain and Portugal were able to hold their American possessions a generation longer than the English, but in the end practically all of the western hemisphere, with the exception of Canada, completely freed itself from the domination of the European powers. Cuba, one of the very last vestiges of Spanish rule in the West, gained its independence with the aid of the United States in 1899.

REFERENCES

Early English Explorations in America: TYLER, *England in America* (American Nation Series), pp. 1–33; THWAITES, *The Colonies* (Epochs of American History Series), chap. ii, pp. 21–44.

The French in Canada: THWAITES, *The Colonies*, chap. xii, pp. 246–257; *France in America* (American Nation Series), pp. 124–142.

Struggle between England and France: HART, *Formation of the Union* (Epochs of American History Series), pp. 22–41; THWAITES, *France in America*, pp. 157–280.

British Colonial Policy: HART, pp. 44–63; HOWARD, *Preliminaries of the Revolution* (American Nation Series), pp. 22–67, 174–192; LEE, *Source Book of English History*, pp. 474–483.

A Sketch of the American Revolution: HART, pp. 70–101.

CHAPTER VIII

THE OLD RÉGIME IN EUROPE

CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY PEOPLE: SERFDOM

22. If a peasant who lived on a manor in the times of the Crusades had been permitted to return to earth and travel about Europe at the close of the Seven Years' War, he would have found much to remind him of the conditions under which, seven centuries earlier, he had extracted a scanty living from the soil. On the other hand, an American farmer of to-day would find great difficulty in understanding the situation of a Prussian peasant even a century ago. We must therefore glance at the ancient manorial system of the Middle Ages which, in the eighteenth century, still existed in most of the countries of Europe.

Those who till the soil have usually not owned the land

The modern farmer who either owns his land or leases it from the owner for a certain sum annually and then cultivates it in any way he pleases, with the aid of such men as he may hire to help him, is, in fact, a rather novel thing in the world's history. In the past, those who have tilled the soil have commonly been slaves, or half slaves, who worked upon large estates belonging to others. They neither owned nor rented the land in the modern sense of the terms, and yet they often had a certain claim upon it and, so long as they fulfilled their obligations, were not deprived of it.

Slaves replaced by serfs in the Roman Empire

The system of great estates prevailed under the Roman Empire, and the land had originally been cultivated by armies of slaves. Later, however, the slaves disappeared, or merged into a curious intermediate class neither free nor slave, the so-called serfs, which included practically all those who tilled the soil in the Middle Ages. Indeed, a free farmer who had

no means of protecting himself would have stood but a poor chance amidst the violence and disorder which prevailed during the barbarian invasions and the feudal period. Consequently all through the Middle Ages the great estates still continued to exist, peopled by serfs who were protected to a certain degree by the lord of the manor.

The serf bound to the soil

The lord, who lived in a castle or solidly built house, reserved for himself a goodly number of fields. The rest of the estate was divided up among the serfs, who were not ordinarily deprived of their holdings so long as they served their lord and paid him the customary dues. These holdings passed down from father to son; and in case the manor changed hands, the peasants went with it, just as did the wretched hovels in which they lived and the trees and brooks. For the serf was not at liberty to leave the manor, and in case of flight he might be pursued like a fugitive slave. He was, in short, bound to the land.

Services required from the serf by the lord of the manor

The serfs were required to till those fields which the lord reserved for himself and to gather his crops. They might not marry without the lord's permission, and their wives and children must render such assistance as was required in the manor house. We have many exact statements of what the serfs owed the lord upon whose estate they were fixed. To take a single instance from an English village in 1279: William Modi, a serf, holds from Sir Baldwin a cottage and twelve acres of land. For this he must, among other things, work for the lord two days a week for the greater part of the year and, during August and September, must see that at least two acres of Sir Baldwin's grain are harvested each day. He must put his cart at the lord's disposal on certain occasions and mow in his field the whole of one day. "And he owes at Christmas four hens and a cock and forty eggs, and on St. Peter's day he shall give five ducks. And about Christmas time he shall thresh in the barn of his lord sixteen bushels of barley and make malt of this at his house and dry it, and then carry it to the mill to be ground, and then from the mill to the kitchen of his lord."

The manor court

All the men were, moreover, expected to be present at the "court" of the lord where the business of the manor was transacted under the supervision of his representative. Here disputes were settled and fines were imposed for disorder or for violating the customs of the manor. These fines were a somewhat important source of income to the lord, who found this privilege of administering justice a valuable one. While the services and dues varied on different manors those enumerated above give a very just idea of the general conditions which prevailed for centuries throughout western Europe.

The serf an inferior farmer who could only exist when there was plenty of land

The serf was ordinarily a bad farmer and workman. He cultivated the soil in a very crude manner, and his crops were accordingly scanty and inferior. Obviously serfdom could exist only as long as land was plentiful. Serfdom would, therefore, naturally tend to disappear when the population so increased that the carelessly cultivated fields no longer supplied the food necessary for the growing numbers.

Disappearance of serfdom begins in France and England

Serfdom began to die out first in France and England. As time went on, neither the lord nor the serf was satisfied with the ancient primitive arrangements which had answered well enough in the time of Charlemagne. The serfs, on the one hand, began to obtain money by the sale of their products in the markets of neighboring towns. They soon found it more profitable to pay the lord a certain sum instead of working for him, for they could then turn their whole attention to their own holdings. The land owners, on the other hand, found it to their advantage to accept money in place of the services of their tenants. With this money they could hire laborers to cultivate their own fields and buy the luxuries which were brought to their notice as commerce increased. So it came about that the lords gradually renounced their control over the peasants, and the serf was no longer easily distinguishable from the freeman who paid a regular rent for his land.[1]

[1] A serf might gain his liberty by fleeing to a town. In England, if he remained undiscovered by his lord for a year and a day, he became a freeman.

Serfdom still existed in the eighteenth century

The gradual extinction of serfdom in western Europe appears to have begun as early as the twelfth century, but proceeded at very different rates in the various countries. In France the old type of serf had largely disappeared by the fourteenth century and in England a hundred years later. In Prussia, Austria, Poland, Russia, Italy, and Spain, on the contrary, the great mass of the country people were still bound to the soil in the eighteenth century.

Survivals of manorial system in France in the eighteenth century

Even in France there were still many aggravating traces of the old system. The peasant was, it is true, no longer bound to a particular manor; he could buy or sell his land at will, could marry without consulting the lord, and could go and come as he pleased. Many bought their land outright, while others disposed of their holdings and settled in town. But the lord might still require all those on his manor to grind their grain at his mill, bake their bread in his oven, and press their grapes in his winepress. The peasant might have to pay a toll to cross a bridge or ferry which was under the lord's control, or a certain sum for driving his flock past the lord's mansion. Many of the old arrangements still forced the peasant occupying a particular plot of land to turn over to the lord a certain portion of his crops and, if he sold his land, to pay the lord a part of the money he received for it.

Survivals in England of the manorial system

In England in the eighteenth century the prominent features of serfdom had disappeared more completely than in France. The services in labor due to the lord had long been commuted into money payments and the peasant was thus transformed into a renter or owner of his holding. He still took off his hat to the squire of his village and was liable to be severely punished by his lord, who was usually a justice of the peace, if he was caught shooting a hare on the game preserves. Moreover, many traces of feudal dues and restrictions remained in their old form until the nineteenth century and the subserviency of the agricultural laborers to the landed proprietors is still strongly marked. As late as 1809 the town

of Manchester had to get the consent of the lord of the manor before it could incorporate a waterworks company; and in 1839 the town of Leeds had to pay thirteen thousand pounds to its former lord in order to extinguish the old obligation of grinding corn at his mill.

Condition of the serfs in a great part of Europe in the eighteenth century

In central, southern, and eastern Europe the mediæval system still prevailed; the peasant lived and died upon the same manor and worked for his lord in the same way that his ancestors had worked a thousand years before. Everywhere the same crude agricultural instruments were still used and most of the implements and tools were roughly made in the village itself. The wooden plows commonly found even on English farms were constructed on the model of the old Roman plow; wheat was cut with a sickle, grass with an unwieldy scythe, and the wretched cart wheels were supplied only with wooden rims.

Wretched houses of the peasants

The houses occupied by the country people differed greatly from Sicily to Pomerania, and from Ireland to Poland; but, in general, they were small, with little light or ventilation, and often they were nothing but wretched hovels with dirt floors and neglected thatch roofs. The pigs and the cows were frequently better housed than the people, with whom they associated upon very familiar terms since the barn and the house were commonly in the same building. The drinking water was bad and there was no attempt to secure proper drainage. Fortunately every one was out of doors a great deal of the time, for the women as well as the men usually worked in the fields cultivating the soil and helping to gather in the crops.

Unattractive character of country life

Country life in the eighteenth century was obviously very arduous and unattractive for the most part. The peasant had no newspapers to tell him of the world outside his manor, nor could he have read them had he had them. Even in England not one farmer in five thousand, it is said, could read at all; and in France the local tax collectors were too uneducated to make out their own reports. Farther east conditions

must have been still more cheerless, for a Hungarian peasant complains that he owed four days of his labor to his lord, spent the fifth and sixth hunting and fishing for him, while the seventh belonged to God.

The Towns and the Guilds

Towns still mediæval in the eighteenth century

23. Even in the towns there was much to remind one of the Middle Ages. The narrow, crooked streets, darkened by the overhanging buildings and scarcely lighted at all by night, the rough cobblestones, the disgusting odors even in the best quarters, — all offered a marked contrast to the European cities of to-day, which have grown tremendously in the last hundred years in size, beauty, and comfort.

London

In 1760 London had half a million inhabitants, or about a tenth of its present population. There were of course no street cars or omnibuses, to say nothing of the thousands of hansom cabs which now thread their way in and out through the press of traffic. A few hundred hackney coaches and sedan chairs served to carry those who had not private conveyances and could not, or would not, walk. The ill-lighted streets were guarded at night by watchmen who went about with lanterns but afforded so little protection against the roughs and robbers that gentlemen were compelled to carry arms when passing through the streets after nightfall.

Paris

Paris was somewhat larger than London and had outgrown its mediæval walls. The police were more efficient there, and the highway robberies which disgraced London and its suburbs were almost unknown. The great park, the "Elysian fields," and the boulevards which now form so distinguished a feature of Paris, were already laid out; but, in general, the streets were still narrow, and there were none of the fine broad avenues which now radiate from a hundred centers. There were few sewers to carry off the water which, when it rained, flowed through the middle of the streets. The filth and the bad

smells of former times still remained and the people relied upon easily polluted wells or the dirty river Seine for their water supply.

German towns

In Germany very few of the towns had spread beyond their mediæval walls. They had, for the most part, lost their former prosperity, which was still attested by the fine houses of the merchants and of the once flourishing guilds. Berlin had a population of about two hundred thousand, and Vienna slightly more. The latter city, now one of the most beautiful in the world, then employed from thirty to a hundred street cleaners and boasted that the street lamps were lighted every night, while many towns contented themselves with dirty streets and with light during the winter months, and then only when the moon was not scheduled to shine.

Italian cities

Even the famous cities of Italy, — Milan, Genoa, Florence, Rome, — notwithstanding their beautiful palaces and public buildings, were, with the exception of water-bound Venice, crowded into the narrow compass of the town wall and their streets were narrow and crooked.

Trade and industry conducted upon a small scale

Another contrast between the towns of the eighteenth century and those of to-day lay in the absence of the great wholesale warehouses, the vast factories with their tall chimneys, and the attractive department stores which may now be found in every city from Dublin to Budapest. Commerce and industry were in general conducted upon a very small scale, except at the great ports like London, Antwerp, or Hamburg, where goods coming from and going to the colonies were brought together.

The growth of industry under the influence of the various machines which were being invented during the latter part of the eighteenth century will form the subject of a later chapter. It is clear, however, that before the introduction of railroads, steamships, and machine-equipped factories, all business operations must have been carried on in what would seem to us a slow and primitive fashion.

The trades organized into guilds

A great part of the manufacturing still took place in little shops where the articles when completed were offered for sale. Generally all those who owned the several shops carrying on a particular trade, such as tailoring, shoemaking, baking, tanning, bookbinding, hair cutting, or the making of candles, knives, hats, artificial flowers, swords, or wigs, were organized into a guild — a union — the main object of which was to prevent all other citizens from making or selling the articles in which the members of the guild dealt. The number of master workmen who might open a shop of their own was often limited by the guild as well as the number of apprentices each master could train. The period of apprenticeship was long, sometimes seven or even nine years, on the ground that it took years to learn the trade properly, but really because the guild wished to maintain its monopoly by keeping down the number who could become masters. When the apprenticeship was over, the workman became a "journeyman" and might never perhaps become a master workman and open a shop of his own.

Guilds in England

This guild system had originated in the Middle Ages and was consequently hundreds of years old. In England the term of seven years was required for apprenticeship in all the staple trades, although the rule was by no means universally enforced. In Sheffield no master cutler could have more than one apprentice at a time; the master weavers of Norfolk and Norwich were limited to two apprentices each, and no master hatter in England could have more than two.

Guilds in France and Germany

In France the guilds were more powerful than in England since they had been supported and encouraged by Colbert, who believed that they kept up the standard of French products. In Germany the organization was much stricter and more widespread than either in England or in France. Old regulations concerning apprenticeship and the conduct of the various trades were still enforced. No master could have more than one apprentice, manage more than one workshop, or sell goods that he had not himself produced.

Strife among the guilds

Everywhere a workman had to stick to his trade; if a cobbler should venture to make a pair of new boots, or a baker should roast a piece of meat in his oven, he might be expelled from the guild unless he made amends. In Paris a hatter, who had greatly increased his trade by making hats of wool mixed with silk, had his stock destroyed by the guild authorities on the ground that the rules only permitted hats to be made of wool and said nothing of silk. The trimming makers had an edict passed forbidding any one to make buttons that were cast, or turned, or made of horn.

The guilds not only protected themselves against workmen who opened a shop without their permission but each particular trade was in more or less constant disagreement with the other trades as to what each might make. The goldsmiths were the natural enemies of all who used gold in their respective operations, such as the clock and watch makers, the money changers, and those who set precious stones. Those who dealt in natural flowers were not allowed to encroach upon those who made artificial ones. One who baked bread must not make pies or cakes. The tailor who mended clothes must not permit himself to make new garments.

Three important differences between the guilds and the modern trade unions

The guilds differed from the modern trade unions in several important respects. In the first place, it was only the master workmen, who owned the shops, tools, or machines, who belonged to them. The apprentices and journeymen, i.e. the ordinary workmen, were excluded and had no influence whatever upon the policy of the organization. In the second place, the government enforced the decisions of the guilds. For example, in Paris, if it were learned that a journeyman goldbeater was working for himself, a representative of the guild betook himself to the offender's house, accompanied by a town officer, and seized his tools and materials, after which the unfortunate man might be sent to the galleys for three years or perhaps get off with a heavy fine, imprisonment, and the loss of every chance of ever becoming a master. Lastly, the guilds were confined

to the old-established industries which were still carried on, as they had been during the Middle Ages, on a small scale in the master's house.

Decline of the guilds

In spite, however, of the seeming strength of the guilds, they were really giving way before the entirely new conditions which had arisen. Thoughtful persons disapproved of them on the ground that they hampered industry and prevented progress by their outworn restrictions. In many towns the regulations were evaded or had broken down altogether, so that enterprising workmen and dealers carried on their business as they pleased. Then, as we have said, it was only the old industries that were included in the guild system. The newer manufactures, of silk and cotton goods, porcelain, fine glassware, etc., which had been introduced into Europe, were under the control of individuals or companies who were independent of the old guilds and relied upon monopolies and privileges granted by the rulers, who, in France at least, were glad to foster new industries.

The Nobility

24. Not only had the mediæval manor and the mediæval guilds maintained themselves down into the eighteenth century but the successors of the feudal lords continued to exist as a conspicuous and powerful class which enjoyed various privileges and distinctions denied to the ordinary citizen, although they were, of course, shorn of the great power that the more important dukes and counts had enjoyed in the Middle Ages, when they ruled over vast tracts, could summon their vassals to assist them in their constant wars with their neighbors, and dared defy even the authority of the king himself.

The former independence of the feudal nobles lost by the eighteenth century

It is impossible to recount here how the English, French, and Spanish kings gradually subjugated the turbulent barons and brought the great fiefs directly under royal control. Suffice it to say that the monarchs met with such success that in the eighteenth century the nobles no longer held aloof but

eagerly sought the king's court. Those whose predecessors had once been veritable sovereigns within their own domains, had declared war even against the king, coined money, made laws for their subjects, and meted out justice in their castle halls, had, by the eighteenth century, deserted their war horses and laid aside their long swords; in their velvet coats and high-heeled shoes they were contented with the privilege of helping the king to dress in the morning and attending him at dinner. The battlemented castle, once the stronghold of independent chieftains, was transformed into a tasteful country residence where, if the king honored the owner with a visit, the host was no longer tempted, as his ancestors had been, to shower arrows and stones upon the royal intruder.

The French nobility

The French noble, unlike the English, was not fond of the country but lived with the court at Versailles whenever he could afford to do so, and often when he could not. He liked the excitement of the court, and it was there that he could best advance his own and his friends' interests by obtaining lucrative offices in the army or Church or in the king's palace. By their prolonged absence from their estates the nobles lost the esteem of their tenants, while their stewards roused the hatred of the peasants by strictly collecting all the ancient manorial dues in order that the lord might enjoy the gayeties at Versailles.

The French nobility a privileged class

The unpopularity of the French nobility was further increased by their exemptions from some of the heavy taxes, on the ground that they were still supposed to shed their blood in fighting for their king instead of paying him money like the unsoldierly burghers and peasants. They enjoyed, moreover, the preference when the king had desirable positions to grant. They also claimed a certain social superiority, since they were excluded by their traditions of birth from engaging in any ordinary trade or industry, although they might enter some professions, such as medicine, law, the Church, or the army, or even participate in maritime trade without derogating from

their rank. In short, the French nobility, including some one hundred and thirty thousand or one hundred and forty thousand persons, constituted a privileged class, although they no longer performed any of the high functions which had been exercised by their predecessors.

The ennobled

To make matters worse, very few of the nobles really belonged to old feudal families. For the most part they had been ennobled by the king for some supposed service, or had bought an office, or a judgeship in the higher courts, to which noble rank was attached. Naturally this circumstance served to rob them of much of the respect that their hereditary dignity and titles might otherwise have gained for them.

Peculiar position of the English peerage

In England the feudal castles had disappeared earlier even than in France, and the English law did not grant to any one, however long and distinguished his lineage, special rights or privileges not enjoyed by every freeman. Nevertheless there was a distinct noble class in England. The monarch had formerly been accustomed to summon his counts and some of his barons to take council with him and in this way the peerage developed; this included those whose title permitted them to sit in the House of Lords and to transmit this honorable prerogative to their eldest sons. But the peers paid the same taxes as did every other subject and were punished in the same manner if they were convicted of an offense. Moreover only the eldest surviving son of a noble father inherited his rank, while on the Continent all the children became nobles. In this way the number of the English nobility was greatly restricted and their social distinction roused little antagonism.

The German knights still resembled mediæval lords

In Germany, however, the nobles continued to occupy very much the same position which their ancestors held in the Middle Ages. There had been no king to do for all Germany what the French kings had done for France; no mighty man had risen strong enough to batter down castle walls and bend all barons, great and small, to his will. The result was that there were in Germany in the eighteenth century hundreds

of nobles dwelling in strong old castles and ruling with a high hand domains which were sometimes no larger than an American township. They levied taxes, held courts, coined money, and maintained standing armies of perhaps only a handful of soldiers.

The chief noble was the king

In all the countries of Europe the chief noble was of course the monarch himself,[1] to whose favor almost all the lesser nobles owed their titles and rank. He was, except in England, always despotic, permitting the people no share in the management of the government and often rendering them miserable by needless wars and ill-advised and oppressive taxes. He commonly maintained a very expensive court and gave away to unworthy courtiers much of the money which he had wrung from his people. He was permitted to imprison his subjects upon the slightest grounds and in the most unjust manner. Nevertheless, he usually enjoyed the loyalty and respect of all classes of his subjects, who were generally ready to attribute his bad acts to evil councilors.

His arbitrary powers

The services performed by even despotic kings

On the whole the king merited the respect paid him. He it was who had destroyed the power of innumerable lesser despots and created something like a nation. He had put a stop to the private warfare and feudal brigandage which had disgraced the Middle Ages. His officers maintained order throughout the country so that merchants and travelers could go to and fro with little danger. He opened highroads for them and established a general system of coinage which greatly facilitated business operations. He interested himself more and more in commerce and industry and often encouraged learning. Finally, by consolidating his realms and establishing a regular system of government, he prepared the way for the European State of to-day in which the people are either accorded an effective control of the lawmaking and the disposition of the

[1] All the European countries were monarchies in the eighteenth century except the half-monarchical United Netherlands, Switzerland, and the tiny republics of San Marino in Italy and of Andorra in the Pyrenees. The monarchs of the eighteenth century are discussed in chap. x.

public revenue or, as in the case of France, the monarch has been discarded altogether as no longer needful.

The Catholic Church

Importance of the mediæval Church in explaining modern problems

25. The eighteenth century had inherited from the Middle Ages not only the nobility but the clergy, who, except in England, were set off by their peculiar powers and privileges from the nation at large. They were far more powerful and better organized than the nobility and exercised a potent influence in the State. The clergy owed their authority to the Church, which for many centuries had been the great central institution of Europe. The mediæval Church serves to explain more of the problems which have faced reformers in modern times than even the feudal and manorial systems. We must therefore look back for a moment to a time — let us say five hundred years before the period with which we are dealing — when all western Europe was still loyal to its head, the Pope, when the Church was still the soul of almost every great enterprise, and the State had not yet gained the necessary strength to wrest from it gradually many of its prerogatives and a part of its wealth.

Every one required to belong to the Church in the Middle Ages

In the first place, every one, in the Middle Ages, was required to belong to the Church, somewhat in the same way that we to-day all belong as a matter of course to the State. It is true that one was not born into the Church as we are into the State, but he was ordinarily baptized into it before he had any opinion in the matter. All western Europe formed a single religious association, from which it was a crime to revolt. To refuse allegiance to the Church, or to question its authority or teachings, was reputed treason against God, the most terrible of all crimes. When the clergy declared a person guilty of heresy (as a rejection of the Church's doctrines was called), the king's officials were by law required to execute him, since doubt and disbelief were regarded not merely as sinful, but as

a criminal revolt against an institution which practically every one esteemed more essential to the existence of order and civilization than was even the king's authority.

The income of the Church from its land and the tithe

The Church did not rely for its support, as churches usually must to-day, upon the voluntary contributions of its members, but enjoyed the revenue from vast domains which kings, nobles, and other landholders had from time to time given to the churches and monasteries. Practically none of this land was ever sold or given up, and consequently the Church's income continued to increase from generation to generation as new gifts were made. This accumulation of property in the hands of those who could not part with it has been a source of much trouble between the clergy and the various European governments. In addition to the income from its lands and from a considerable variety of fees and contributions, the Church had the right, like the State, to impose a regular tax called the *tithe*. All who were subject to this were forced to pay it whether they cared anything about religion or not, just as we are all compelled to pay taxes imposed by the government under which we live, even if we should prefer an entirely different constitution.

Many cases decided by Church courts

Like the State the Church had, moreover, an elaborate system of law and its own courts in which its officials tried many cases which are now settled in the civil tribunals. One may get some idea of the business of the ecclesiastical courts from the fact that the Church claimed the right to try all cases in which a clergyman was involved, or any one connected with the Church or under its special protection, such as monks, students, crusaders, widows, orphans, and the helpless in general. Then all cases where matters of religion were involved, such as the sacraments of the Church, or its prohibitions, came ordinarily before its courts, as for example, those concerning marriage, wills, sworn contracts, usury, blasphemy, sorcery, heresy, and so forth. The Church had its prisons, too, to which it might sentence offenders to lifelong detention.

The Church not only performed the functions of a state, making laws for its members, taxing them, and trying and punishing them if they broke its laws; it had also the organization of a state. Unlike the Protestant ministers of to-day, all churchmen and all religious associations of mediæval Europe were under one supreme head, the Roman pontiff, who made laws for all and controlled every Church officer, bishop, or priest, wherever he might be, whether in Italy, Spain, Germany, or Ireland. The Pope's control was facilitated by the circumstance that the Church had one official language — Latin — in which all communications were written and its services everywhere conducted.

The Church a monarchy with the Pope at its head

The mediæval Church may, therefore, properly be called a great international monarchy embracing all the peoples of western Europe regardless of their race or the character of their civil government. The Pope was its all-powerful and absolute ruler in the same sense that Louis XIV was legally the absolute ruler of the French state. The Pope concentrated in his person, according to the laws of the Church, its entire spiritual and temporal authority. He was the supreme lawgiver. No council of the Church, no matter how large and representative, could make laws against his will; for its decrees, to be valid, required his sanction. He could set aside or abrogate any law of the Church, however ancient, so long as it was not ordained by the Bible or by nature. He might, for good reasons, make exceptions to all merely human law. He was not only the supreme lawgiver but the supreme judge as well. Any one in any part of Europe could appeal to him at any stage in almost any case.

The supreme powers of the Pope

As supreme head of the Church the Pope naturally claimed the right under certain circumstances to annul the decrees of all other earthly powers. Ordinarily the Church left the kings and princes to make laws and rule their peoples, so far as the interests of this world were concerned, as they pleased, but the Pope felt in duty bound — since he was answerable for

The Pope claimed the right under certain circumstances to annul the laws of a state

the eternal welfare of every Christian — to restrain a sinful and perverse prince and to declare unrighteous laws null and void. Should all else fail, he claimed the right to free a nation which was being led to disaster in this world and to perdition in the next from its allegiance to a wicked monarch.

Great service of the Church in supplying the deficiencies of feudalism

The influence which the Church and its head exercised over the civil government in the Middle Ages was due largely to the absence of any orderly states in the modern sense of the term. There were only weak kings and refractory feudal lords to whom disorder was the very breath of life. There were few, if any, strong, efficient rulers who could count upon the support of a large body of prosperous and loyal subjects. So long as this feudal anarchy continued, the Church endeavored to supply the deficiencies of the turbulent and ignorant princes by striving to maintain order, administer justice, protect the weak, and encourage learning.

The problem of the relation of Church and State

So soon, however, as the modern State began to develop, difficulties arose. The clergy naturally clung to the powers and privileges which they had long enjoyed, and which they believed to be rightly theirs. On the other hand, the State, so soon as it felt itself able to manage its own affairs, protect its subjects, and provide for their worldly interests, was less and less inclined to tolerate the interference of the clergy and of their head, the Pope.

Laymen replace the clergy in the king's government

Educated laymen were becoming more and more common — above all, lawyers trained in the Roman law — and the king was no longer obliged to rely mainly upon the assistance of the clergy in conducting his government. It was natural that he should look with disfavor upon their privileges, which put them upon a different footing from the great mass of his subjects, and upon their wealth, which he would deem excessive and dangerous to his power. This situation raised the fundamental problem of the proper relation of Church and State, upon which Europe has been working ever since the fourteenth century and has not yet completely solved.

Among the many difficulties and contentions which were constantly arising between the clergy and the various European governments were the following:

Four chief subjects of contention between the Church and the State

1. Should the king or the Pope enjoy the privilege of selecting the important Church officials, — the archbishops and bishops and the abbots of the great and rich monasteries? Naturally both king and Pope were anxious to place their own friends and supporters in these influential positions. Moreover the Pope came to claim a considerable contribution from those he appointed and the king grudged him the money.

1. Who should choose the Church officials?

2. How far might the king venture to tax the lands and other property of the clergy which he, or his predecessors, and the feudal lords had donated for the support of the churches and monasteries? Was this vast amount of property to be permitted to increase indefinitely and yet contribute nothing to the maintenance of the government? The clergy commonly maintained that their possessions were dedicated to God's service and that they needed all their revenue in order to support themselves with proper dignity, conduct the religious services, keep up the churches and monasteries, aid the poor and afflicted, and carry on the schools, since the State left them to bear all these burdens. The law of the Church permitted the clergy to make voluntary contributions to the king when there was urgent necessity and the resources of the laity proved inadequate, but the Pope maintained that except in the most critical cases his consent must be obtained for such grants upon the part of the clergy.

2. How far could the king tax the clergy?

3. There was inevitable jealousy on the part of the king and his judges in respect to the cases which the clergy had drawn into their own courts and the exemption from trial before the regular courts which they claimed. Still graver disadvantages were to be ascribed to the misuse of the right of appeal to the Pope's great central court at Rome, whither cases were carried upon every pretense. The head of the Church maintained that no one might prevent cases being freely brought before him,

3. Question of Church courts and appeals to the Pope

and he did not hesitate to reverse the decisions of the royal courts. The result was that matters which should have been adjusted in London or Paris, where the facts were known and the witnesses were readily assembled, were frequently carried to a distant city where the best intentioned Pope could hardly expect to see justice done.

4. How far might the Pope interfere in the affairs of a state?

4. Lastly, there was the most fundamental problem of all; namely, the extent to which the Pope, as the universally recognized religious head of the Church, was justified in interfering with the temporal or worldly concerns of a particular state. Unfortunately almost every matter could be viewed from a religious as well as from a worldly standpoint. A contract might relate to purely secular affairs but, if it was solemnized by an oath, it received a religious sanction which seemed to bring the question of its violation within the scope of the ecclesiastical courts. Marriage was held to be a sacrament, a holy act, and was not legitimate unless performed by the priest, but dowries and rights of inheritance seemed to be matters for adjustment by the state officials. Every crime or misdemeanor was, in the last analysis, a *sin*, so there seemed no limit to the questions which the Pope and clergy might claim the right to consider. The Pope's powers were consequently very great and very vague, and there has always been a wide range of difference even among devout Catholics in regard to their extent.

The Pope never surrenders any powers once conceded to him

It may be said in general that the Pope has always laid claim to all the authority which any of his predecessors, or the theologians, have at any time attributed to the Roman see. He does not, however, exercise it in its plenitude, sometimes because he is unable to enforce his will, sometimes because he judges it best, in the interest of the Church, to make exceptions and concessions in special agreements with various Catholic rulers. He does not thereby surrender, however, any of the imposing prerogatives which he believes that God has vested in him as the successor of Saint Peter, the chief of the apostles,

to whom the right of loosing and binding upon earth and in heaven was granted by Christ himself.

Struggles between the Popes and the German, French, and English rulers

The Popes have, through the centuries, been forced to accept many insults and some personal violence from princes who, although they believed the Pope to be the divinely appointed head of the Church, nevertheless protested against his interference in secular matters. The German emperors fought with him over the question of patronage, which was a vital matter to them; Philip the Fair of France, about the year 1300, engaged in a bitter controversy with Boniface VIII over the king's right to tax the property of the clergy. Fifty years later the English Parliament forbade any representative of the Pope bearing a papal appointment to an English benefice to enter the kingdom. No one was to appeal to the Pope in such matters; and to act under the Pope's authority, except with the king's special permission, was declared a crime punishable with death.

Peaceful arrangements made between the Pope and the rulers

Yet the gradual reduction of the powers of the clergy was due not so much to violent altercations with the papacy as to peaceful arrangements; for example, those by which the clergy undertook to make "free gifts" to the king of France, or the Pope agreed to share his patronage with the Emperor, allowing him to fill the benefices which fell vacant every other month beginning with January. In 1516 the Pope agreed to permit the French kings to nominate archbishops, bishops, and abbots, and pledged himself to appoint the king's candidates, if suitable men, on the understanding that he should receive a contribution, called the *Annates*, from each benefice which was so filled.

Concordat of 1516

Ways in which the kings got cases into their own courts

As to the important controversy over lawsuits, the king had always stoutly maintained his right to try all cases involving land, since that was certainly a purely worldly matter. Then the king's lawyers claimed many other cases on the ground that their religious aspects were merely accidental and thus brought a great part of the matrimonial cases and those concerning

contracts and wills into the king's tribunals. The "benefit of clergy," as their right to be tried by their own courts was called, was also steadily reduced in one way or another. In England many new laws were passed whose violation was made felony "without benefit of clergy." In France the same end was reached rather more indirectly. Moreover the French and English kings only regarded as law such of the papal decrees as they had ratified, and they permitted no lands to be given to the Church without their permission.

The Protestant revolt from the Pope

After several great Church congresses, known as general councils, had vainly attempted in the fifteenth century to remedy the abuses that had grown up in the Church and limit the general powers of the Pope, a considerable portion of northern Europe finally revolted from the papacy altogether, namely, northern Germany, Norway and Sweden, England, Scotland, the Dutch Netherlands, and parts of Switzerland. The Protestant rulers of these countries refused longer to recognize the Pope except as an Italian prince. They took matters boldly into their own hands, adopted new doctrines (which they usually imposed upon their subjects), confiscated the property of the monasteries, and scattered the monks and nuns. They brought all the property of the Church under their control and used such part of it as they saw fit to support the particular form of Christianity which they professed. Nevertheless, even in Protestant lands many vestiges of the old system still remained in the eighteenth century, especially in England.

The importance of the Council of Trent (1545–1563)

After the Protestant revolt, representatives of the clergy from the countries which still remained Catholic — France, Italy, Spain, Austria, and southern Germany — assembled at Trent, where prolonged sessions were held from 1545 to 1563 to consider once more the reform of the Church. This Council of Trent is memorable in the history of Europe. Its decrees, far more numerous and detailed than those of any previous council, provided a new and solid basis for the doctrines and law of the Roman Catholic Church. The old doctrines were

ratified and the Protestant innovations declared accursed. Certain abuses were corrected but all attempts to limit the power of the Pope failed, since his delegates really guided the deliberation of the council. Some of the Catholic princes were disappointed in the results, and the French courts refused to sanction the council's decrees.

The Jesuits and Ultramontanism

26. Among those who, during the final sessions of the Council of Trent, sturdily opposed every attempt to reduce in any way the exalted powers of the Pope, was the head of a new religious society which was becoming the most powerful organization in Europe, — the Society of Jesus, or Jesuits, as they are commonly called. This most faithful of all the Pope's allies was founded by a Spaniard named Ignatius Loyola. He conceived of a new association which, unlike the older monastic orders, should aim not so much at the salvation of its own members through fasts and chants and spiritual meditation as to promote the glory of God by serving the Church and its head, the Roman pontiff.

Rigid organization and discipline of the Jesuits

In 1538 Loyola summoned his followers to Rome, and there they worked out the principles of their order. The Pope then incorporated these in a bull in which he gave his sanction to the new organization. The society was to be under the absolute control of a *general*, who was to be chosen for life by the great assembly of the order. Loyola had been a soldier, and he laid great and constant stress upon the source of all efficient military discipline, namely, absolute and unquestioning obedience. This he declared to be the mother of all virtue and happiness. Not only were the members to obey the Pope as Christ's representative on earth, and undertake without hesitation any journey, no matter how distant or perilous, which he might command, but each was to obey his superiors in the order as if he were receiving directions from Christ in person.

He must have no will or preference of his own, but must be as the staff which supports and aids its bearer in any way in which he sees fit to use it. This admirable organization and incomparable discipline were the great secret of the later influence of the Jesuits.

Objects and methods of the new order

The object of the society was to cultivate piety and the love of God, especially through example. The members were to pledge themselves to lead a pure life of poverty and devotion. Their humility was to show itself in face and attitude, so that their very appearance should attract to the service of God those with whom they came in contact. The methods adopted by the society for reaching its ends are of the utmost importance. A great number of its members were priests, who went about preaching, hearing confession, and encouraging devotional exercises. But the Jesuits were teachers as well as preachers and confessors. They clearly perceived the advantage of bringing young people under their influence, and they became the schoolmasters of Catholic Europe. So successful were their methods of instruction that even Protestants sometimes sent their children to them.

Rapid increase of the Jesuits in numbers

It was originally proposed that the number of persons admitted to the order should not exceed sixty; but this limit was speedily removed, and before the death of Loyola over a thousand persons had joined the society. Under his successor the number was trebled and it went on increasing for two centuries.

Their missions and explorations

The founder of the order had been attracted to missionary work from the first, and the Jesuits rapidly spread not only throughout Europe but over the whole world. Francis Xavier, one of Loyola's original little band, went to Hindustan, the Moluccas, and Japan. Brazil, Florida, Mexico, and Peru were soon fields of active missionary work at a time when Protestants did not dream as yet of carrying Christianity to the heathen. We owe to the reports of Jesuits like Marquette much of our knowledge of the condition of America when white

men first began to explore Canada and the Mississippi Valley; for the followers of Loyola boldly penetrated into regions unknown to Europeans, and settled among the natives with the purpose of bringing the Gospel to them.

Their fight against the Protestants

Dedicated as they were to the service of the Pope, the Jesuits early directed their energies against Protestantism. They sent their members into Germany and the Netherlands, and even made strenuous efforts to reclaim England. Their success was most apparent in southern Germany and Austria, where they became the confessors and confidential advisers of the rulers. They not only succeeded in checking the progress of Protestantism but were able to reconquer for the Pope some districts in which the old faith had been abandoned.

Sources of unpopularity of the Jesuits

The Jesuits were naturally abhorred in Protestant countries, where they were popularly believed to be absolutely unscrupulous in working for their ends.[1] Even in Catholic countries there were many thoughtful persons who disapproved of their tendency to exalt the papal prerogatives at the cost of the rights of the bishops and of the king. Thus the Jesuits came to be regarded as the chief defenders of what is now known in France, Germany, and Austria as *ultramontanism*.

Ultramontanism

The ultramontane, or "beyond-the-mountain," party was so called by its enemies because it looked across the Alps

[1] Protestants realized that the new order was their most powerful and dangerous enemy. Their apprehensions produced a bitter hatred which blinded them to the high purposes of the founders of the order and led them to attribute an evil motive to every act of the Jesuits. The Jesuits' air of humility the Protestants declared to be a mere cloak of hypocrisy under which they carried on their intrigues. The Jesuits' readiness to adjust themselves to circumstances, and the variety of the tasks that they undertook, seemed to their enemies a willingness to resort to any means in order to reach their ends. They were supposed to justify the most deceitful and immoral measures on the ground that the result would be "for the greater glory of God." The very obedience on which the Jesuits laid so much stress was viewed by the hostile Protestant as one of their worst offenses, for he believed that the members of the order were the blind tools of their superiors, and that they would not hesitate even to commit a crime if so ordered.

Doubtless there have been many Jesuits who have not lived up to the principles of their society, and as time went on the order fell away from its standards, as earlier ones had done. It was, as we shall see, abolished by the Pope in 1773, but was restored in 1814, and now has some fifteen thousand members and is growing steadily.

into Italy for the source of authority, and attributed to the bishop of Rome all the powers over churches and governments throughout Christendom which he had asserted during the Middle Ages. The doctrines of the Jesuits were opposed in France by the so-called Gallican, or patriotic, national party which maintained that the authority of the Pope was supreme only in religious matters, and that even in those it was subordinate to that of a general council of Christendom.

The Declaration of Gallican Liberties of 1682

In 1682 the old trouble between the French king and the Pope in regard to filling certain benefices had once more arisen and Louis XIV summoned an assembly of the French clergy. They approved a statement drawn up by the famous Bossuet and known as the Declaration of Gallican Liberties of 1682. This aimed to define in a general way the limits of the spiritual and temporal powers as they were interpreted in France. The first article declared that "Saint Peter and his successors, vicars of Jesus Christ, and even the Church as a whole, has been granted authority from God only in spiritual matters and those which have to do with salvation, and not in temporal or civil affairs; that accordingly the kings and princes are, by God's command, subject (as princes) to no ecclesiastical authority in temporal matters; they may not be deposed directly or indirectly by the Church, and their subjects may not be released from their obedience to them or freed from their oath of fidelity." [1]

Febronius and his book on the Pope and the Church

The Declaration of Gallican Liberties helped later to spread and consolidate the opposition to the extreme papal claims and the doctrines of the Jesuits. A German scholar, Hontheim, associated with the archbishop of Treves, after a careful investigation of the development of the papal power, wrote an elaborate Latin treatise *On the Present State of the Church and the Legitimate Powers of the Roman Pontiff.*

[1] Other articles added that a general council was superior to the Pope and that only such decrees of the Pope should be observed as had been accepted everywhere or had been sanctioned by the French government and by the French national church.

This he published in 1763, under the assumed name of Justinus Febronius, with the lively hope that the Pope would accept his views. He brought forward evidence to show that the Church was not properly a monarchy, and that all the bishops had originally enjoyed the same powers as the bishop of Rome who, he declared, owed his exaltation mainly to certain forged documents — namely, the pseudo-Isidorian decretals — which some unknown person had invented in the ninth century. The Church had, it is true, made the Pope its head in spiritual matters, but he remained subordinate to a general council. In short, Febronius defended the Gallican liberties and advocated the general adoption in Catholic countries of the policy pursued by France.

The Pope condemns the work of Febronius

His book was immediately condemned by the Pope, who declared that to undermine the papacy, which was the very foundation of the Church, was to destroy the Church itself. Nevertheless the work was translated into German, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, and became a sort of handbook for the princes who were aiming to limit the activities of the clergy and their head.[1] It served to emphasize once more the contrast between the ultramontane theory and that of those Catholics who wished to have the various national churches retain a certain independence of the central papal government.

Great powers still retained by the Catholic Church in the eighteenth century

In spite of the changes which had overtaken the Church since the Middle Ages, it still retained its ancient external appearance in the eighteenth century, — its gorgeous ceremonial, its wealth, its influence over the lives of men, its intolerance of those who ventured to differ from the conceptions of Christianity which it believed to be its duty to impose upon every one. The ecclesiastical courts still tried many cases, in spite of the widening jurisdiction of the royal judges. The Church could fine and imprison those whom it convicted of blasphemy, contempt of religion, or heresy. The clergy

[1] See below, chap. xi.

managed the schools and saw to it that the children were brought up in the orthodox faith. Hospitals and other charitable institutions were under their control. They registered all births and deaths, and only the marriages which they sanctified were regarded by the State as legal. The monasteries still existed in great numbers and owned vast tracts of land. A map of Paris made in 1789 shows no less than sixty-eight monasteries and seventy-three nunneries within the walls. The clergy still forced the laity to pay the tithe as in the Middle Ages and still enjoyed exemption from the direct taxes.

Intolerance of both Catholics and Protestants

Both the Catholic and the Protestant churches were very intolerant, and in this were usually supported by the government, which was ready to punish or persecute those who refused to conform to the State religion, whatever it might be, or ventured to speak or write against its doctrines. There was none of that freedom which is so general now and which permits a man to worship or not as he pleases, and even to denounce religion in any or all its forms without danger of imprisonment, loss of citizenship, or death.

Position of the Protestants in France

In France, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, Protestants had lost all civil rights. According to a decree of 1724, those who assembled for any form of worship other than the Roman Catholic were condemned to lose their property; the men were to be sent to the galleys and the women imprisoned for life. The preachers who convoked such assemblies or performed Protestant ceremonies were punishable with death; yet but few executions took place, for happily the old enthusiasm for persecution was abating. None the less all who did not accept the Catholic teachings were practically outlawed, for the priests would neither recognize the marriages nor register the births and deaths over which they were not called to preside. This made it impossible for Protestants to marry legally and have legitimate children, or to inherit or devise property. A royal proclamation in 1712 forbade physicians to visit such sick people as refused to call in a Catholic

confessor, and the kings still pledged themselves in their coronation oaths to extirpate heretics.

Censorship of the press

Books and pamphlets were carefully examined in order to see if they contained any attacks upon the orthodox Catholic beliefs or might in any way serve to undermine the authority of the Church or of the king. The Pope had long maintained a commission (which still exists) to examine new books, and to publish from time to time a list, called the "Index," of all those which the Church condemned and forbade the faithful to read. The king of France, as late as 1757, issued a declaration establishing the death penalty for those who wrote, printed, or distributed any work which appeared to be an attack upon religion. The teachings of the professors in the university were watched. A clergyman who ventured to compare the healing of the sick by Christ to the cures ascribed to Æsculapius was arrested (about 1750) by order of the king's judges at Paris and forced to leave the country. A considerable number of the most enlightened books issued in France in the eighteenth century were condemned either by the clergy or the king's courts, and were burned by the common hangman or suppressed. Not infrequently the authors, if they could be discovered, were imprisoned.

Censorship ineffective

This did not check speculation, however, and books attacking the old ideas and suggesting reforms in Church and State constantly appeared and were freely circulated.[1] The writers took care not to place their names, or that of the publisher, upon the title-page, and many such books were printed at Geneva or in Holland, where great freedom prevailed.

Strength of the Church in Spain, Austria, and Italy

In Spain, Austria, and Italy, however, and especially in the Papal States, the clergy, particularly the Jesuits, were more powerful and enjoyed more privileges than in France. In Spain the censorship of the press and the Inquisition constituted a double bulwark against change until the latter half of the eighteenth century.

[1] See following chapter.

Peculiar situation of the great German prelates

In Germany the position of the Church varied greatly. The southern states were Catholic, while Prussia and the northern rulers had embraced Protestantism. Many of the archbishops, bishops, and abbots ruled as princes over their own lands and made the best arrangements they could with the Pope.

The English Established Church and the Protestant Sects

The Anglican Church as established under Queen Elizabeth (1558–1603)

27. In England Henry VIII had thrown off his allegiance to the Pope and declared himself the head of the English Church. Under his daughter, Queen Elizabeth (1558–1603), Parliament had established the Church of England. It abolished the mass and sanctioned the Book of Common Prayer which has since remained the official guide to the services in the Anglican Church. The beliefs of the Church were brought together in the Thirty-Nine Articles, from which no one was to vary or depart in the least degree. The system of government of the Roman Catholic Church, with its archbishops, bishops, and priests, was retained but the general charge of religious matters and the appointment of bishops were put in the hands of the monarch or his ministers. All clergymen and government officers were required to subscribe solemnly to the Thirty-Nine Articles. All public religious services were to be conducted according to the Prayer Book, and those who failed to attend services on Sunday and holy days were to be fined.

Persecution of the Catholics in England

Those who persisted in adhering to the Roman Catholic faith fared badly, although happily there were no such general massacres as overwhelmed the Protestants in France. Under the influence of the Jesuits some of the English Catholics became involved in plots against the heretical queen, Elizabeth, who had been deposed by the Pope. These alleged "traitors" were in some instances executed for treason.

Indeed, any one who brought a papal bull to England, who embraced Catholicism, or converted a Protestant was declared a traitor. Fines and imprisonment were inflicted upon those who dared to say or to hear mass.

The Puritans

But there were many Protestants who did not approve of the Anglican Church as established by law. Those who came under the influence of Calvin, the reformer at Geneva, or of his treatise on *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, felt that Parliament had not gone far enough but should have abolished the bishops and priests and all suggestions of the older Roman Catholic service, such as the surplice worn by the priest, kneeling during the communion, and using the sign of the cross at baptism. They made themselves very unpopular by denouncing pastimes, especially on Sunday, and advocating an austere life, and were contemptuously called Puritans. They finally began to defy the government and hold meetings of their own outside the churches. Elizabeth then took measures to break up the custom and imprisoned those who attended these unlawful religious meetings.

Classes of Puritans. The "Low Church" party

From these Puritans, or Dissenters, several parties or sects with differing views developed. There was a "Low Church" party ready to support the Established Church if all "superstitious usages" which suggested the Catholic Church were done away with.

The Presbyterians

Then there were the Presbyterians, followers of Calvin, who held that the Church should rightly be governed by ministers and elders instead of by bishops.

The Separatists, or Independents

Lastly there was an ever-increasing number of Separatists, or Independents. These rejected both the organization of the Church of England and that advocated by the Presbyterians and desired that each religious community should organize itself independently.

The Plymouth colony

Since the government had forbidden the meetings of the Separatists, some of them fled to Holland about the year 1600 and a community of them, under Reverend John Robinson, established themselves at Leyden. In 1620 they determined

to send out a band of colonists to the New World. After many difficulties their ship, the *Mayflower*, reached land in Plymouth Bay, Massachusetts, and there they founded a colony which practiced their form of worship.

The New England Puritans

Eight years later a new band of English Puritans landed to the north of Plymouth and founded Salem and the Massachusetts Bay colony. They agreed in the main in their theological beliefs with the people who had come in the *Mayflower* and soon gave up all connection with the English Church. Their descendants became merged with those of the Plymouth colonists and in this way the Congregational Church was formed, which now has a membership in the United States of about seven hundred thousand.

Congregationalism

The Presbyterians fail to gain England but spread to the United States

Meanwhile the opposition to the Established Church was growing in England. The Presbyterians began their attempt to do away with the bishops and replace them, according to Calvin's system, by elders (presbyters).[1] They succeeded in controlling the Long Parliament which assembled in 1640. This body accordingly summoned a great conclave of Presbyterian divines, who held their sessions in Westminster Abbey for several years (1643–1652) and formulated a new system of doctrines, known as the Westminster Confession, which was to replace the Book of Common Prayer. But with the death of Cromwell and the restoration of Charles II, who was a Catholic at heart, all chance of making Presbyterianism the state religion in England disappeared. Many Dutch, Huguenot, and Scotch-Irish Presbyterians settled, however, in America and there are to-day nearly twice as many Presbyterians in the United States as there are Congregationalists.

The Westminster Confession

[1] Calvin established his church in Geneva about 1540. The name Presbyterian is of course derived from the emphasis which he laid upon the rôle of the *presbyters*, or elders, in the government of the Church. His doctrines spread to southern Germany and Holland. They were espoused by the French Huguenots and introduced into Scotland by John Knox. The Westminster Confession of Faith, while it claims to be based directly upon the Bible, accepts Calvin's interpretations and is really a statement of his teachings. See Robinson, *Readings in European History*, Vol. II, pp. 122 *sqq*.

The Baptists

By far the most numerous of the sects which developed in England was that of the Baptists. They held that infants should not be baptized into the Church but that baptism should be postponed until the believer had reached the age of discretion. Most of them also held that it should be performed by immersion instead of by sprinkling. Not until 1640 did they begin forming churches of their own in England after sending Richard Blount to the Baptist community at Rynsburg, in Holland, where he was duly immersed and then returned to England to immerse his fellow-believers. Like other dissenters they suffered persecution under Charles II. John Bunyan was one of those who were cast into prison, and while there he wrote his *Pilgrim's Progress*.

Roger Williams founds a Baptist community in Rhode Island

Their first prominent representative in America was Roger Williams, who founded a Baptist community in Rhode Island. Since then they have flourished mightily and now have in the United States over forty-six thousand churches and nearly five million members. They were the first Protestant sect to undertake foreign missions on a large scale, having founded a society for that purpose as early as 1792.[1]

The Friends, or Quakers

Another English sect which was destined also to be conspicuous in America was the Society of Friends, or Quakers, as they are commonly called. This group owes its origin to George Fox, who began his preaching in 1647. The Friends were distinguished by their simplicity of life and dress, their abhorrence of war, and their rejection of all ceremonial, including even the Lord's Supper. While there have been fanatics among them whose practices brought discredit upon them both in Old England and New, no branch of the Christian Church

[1] It may be noted here that the Catholics found a refuge in America from their Protestant persecutors as did the Huguenots who fled from the oppression of the Catholic government in France. The colony of Maryland was founded by Lord Baltimore in 1634 and named after the French wife of Charles I. In the nineteenth century the number of Catholics in the United States was vastly increased by immigration from Ireland, Italy, and other countries, so that there are over thirteen millions to-day who have been baptized into the Roman Catholic Church.

has ever shown their religion more consistently or beautifully in their lives than the Friends. Their chief stronghold in America has always been Pennsylvania, more particularly Philadelphia and its neighborhood, where they settled under the leadership of William Penn.

John Wesley and the Methodists

The last of the great Protestant sects to appear was that of the Methodists. Their founder, John Wesley, when at Oxford had founded a religious society among his fellow-students. Their piety and the regularity of their habits gained for them the nickname of "Methodists." After leaving Oxford, Wesley spent some time in the colony of Georgia. On his return to England in 1738 he came to believe in the sudden and complete forgiveness of sins known as "conversion," which he later made the basis of his teaching. He thus describes his own experience: As he entered a meeting in London in 1738 he found the preacher reading Luther's preface to "The Epistle to the Romans." "About a quarter before nine," Wesley reports, "while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ and in Christ alone for salvation, and an assurance was given me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death."

John Wesley's conversion, 1738

This memorable evening marked a turning point in the life of Wesley. He soon began a series of great revival meetings in London and other large towns. He journeyed up and down the land, aided in his preaching by his brother Charles and by the impassioned Whitefield. Only gradually did the Methodists separate themselves from the Church of England, of which they at first considered themselves members. In 1784 the numerous American Methodists were formally organized into the Methodist Episcopal Church, and early in the nineteenth century they became an independent organization in England. At the time of Wesley's death his followers numbered over fifty thousand and there are now in the United States over three millions, including the various branches of the Church.

Parliament under Charles II showed itself very intolerant towards all Dissenters alike, — Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Quakers, Unitarians. Any clergyman who refused to accept everything in the Book of Common Prayer was to lose his benefice, and two thousand clergymen resigned for conscience' sake. In 1664 the Conventicle Act declared that any one attending any religious meeting not held in accordance with the practices of the English Church was liable, for repeated offenses, to be transported to some distant colony, and some of the more obstinate Dissenters were actually exiled. Finally, by the Test Act, every one was excluded from office who did not adhere to the Thirty-Nine Articles.

Persecution of the Dissenters under Charles II

Test Act

Upon the accession of William and Mary an Act of Toleration was passed in 1689 which permitted Dissenters to hold meetings; but "Papists and such as deny the Trinity" were explicitly excluded, so England still continued to maintain an intolerant system in the eighteenth century. It had a State Church with a particular form of belief and of services which was established by the government in Elizabeth's time. Even if the Dissenters were permitted to hold services in their own way, they were excluded from government offices unless they accepted the Thirty-Nine Articles; nor could they obtain a degree at the universities. Only the members of the Anglican Church could hold a benefice. Its bishops had seats in the House of Lords and its priests enjoyed a social preëminence denied to the dissenting ministers.

Legal intolerance in England

The privileges of the Anglican clergy

Those who clung to the Roman Catholic faith, to the Pope and the mass, were forbidden to enter England. The celebration of the mass was strictly prohibited. All public offices were closed to Catholics and of course they could not sit in Parliament. Indeed, legally, they had no right whatever to be in England at all. In the middle of the eighteenth century an English court decided that the law did not recognize the existence of Roman Catholics within the realm and that their presence was only made possible by the lax enforcement of the law.

Existence of Catholics not recognized in England

Freedom of the press in England

The Church courts still existed in England and could punish laymen for not attending church, for heresy, and for certain immoral acts. As late as 1812 a young woman was imprisoned for two years by a Church court because she failed to perform the penance it had imposed and had no money to pay the fees involved in the trial. The ecclesiastical tribunals still tried matrimonial cases and those concerned with wills. But one who published a book or pamphlet did not have to obtain the permission of the government as in France, and nowhere was there such unrestrained discussion of scientific and religious matters at this period as in England. As we shall see in the following chapter, England, in the early eighteenth century, was the center of progressive thought from which the French philosophers and reformers drew their inspiration.

REFERENCES

Germany in the Eighteenth Century: FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 23–27; HENDERSON, *A Short History of Germany*, Vol. II, pp. 219–226.

The French Nobility: LOWELL, *The Eve of the French Revolution*, pp. 70–82.

The English Peerage: MAY, *Constitutional History of England*, chap. v.

Town Life in France: LOWELL, pp. 154–185.

Town Life in England: LECKY, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. II, chap. iv, pp. 97–115; chap. v, pp. 211–228.

Country Life in France: LOWELL, pp. 186–206.

Country Life in England: LECKY, Vol. II, chap. v, pp. 203–211; Vol. VII, chap. xxi, pp. 241–265.

The Clergy in France: LOWELL, pp. 25–39.

Religious Sects in England: LECKY, Vol. III, chap. viii, pp. 1–154; Vol. VI, chap. xvii, pp. 1–47; MAY, chap. xii.

CHAPTER IX

THE SPIRIT OF REFORM

The Development of Modern Science

The spirit of reform

28. A thoughtful observer in the eighteenth century would, as we have seen, have discovered many mediæval institutions which had persisted in spite of the considerable changes which had taken place in conditions and ideas during the previous five hundred years. Serfdom, the guilds, the feudal dues, the nobility and clergy with their peculiar privileges, the declining monastic orders, the confused and cruel laws, — these were a part of the heritage which Europe had received from what was coming to be regarded as a dark and barbarous period. People began to be keenly alive to the deficiencies of the past, and to look to the future for better things, even to dream of progress beyond the happiest times of which they had any record. They came to feel that the chief obstacles to progress were the outworn institutions, the ignorance and prejudices of their forefathers, and that if they could only be freed from this incubus, they would find it easy to create new and enlightened laws and institutions to suit their needs.

Veneration for the past: "the good old days"

This attitude of mind seems natural enough in our progressive age, but two centuries ago it was distinctly new. Mankind has in general shown an unreasoning respect and veneration for the past. Until the opening of the eighteenth century the former times were commonly held to have been better than the present, for the evils of the past were little known while those of the present were, as always, only too apparent. Men looked backward rather than forward. They aspired to fight as well, or be as saintly, or write as good books, or paint as beautiful pictures, as the great men of old. That they might excel the

achievements of their predecessors did not occur to them. Knowledge was sought not by studying the world about them but in some ancient authority. In Aristotle's vast range of works on various branches of science, the Middle Ages felt that they had a mass of authentic information which it should be the main business of the universities to explain and impart rather than to increase or correct it by new investigations. Men's ideals centered in the past, and improvement seemed to them to consist in reviving, so far as possible, the "good old days."[1]

How the scientists have created the spirit of progress and reform

It was mainly to the patient men of science that the western world owed its first hopes of future improvement. It is they who have shown that the ancient writers were mistaken about many serious matters and that they had at best a very crude and imperfect notion of the world. They have gradually robbed men of their old blind respect for the past and, by their discoveries, have pointed the way to indefinite advance, so that now we expect constant change and improvement and are scarcely astonished at the most marvelous inventions.

Roger Bacon advocates experimental science in the thirteenth century

In the Middle Ages the scholars and learned men had been but little interested in the world about them. They devoted far more attention to philosophy and theology than to what we should call the natural sciences. They were satisfied in the main to get their knowledge of nature from reading the works of the ancients, — above all, those of Aristotle. But, as early as the thirteenth century, a very extraordinary Franciscan friar, Roger Bacon, showed his insight by protesting against the exaggerated veneration for books. He foresaw that a careful examination of the things about us — such as water, air, light,

[1] It may be noted that the men of the Renaissance, in renewing the interest in the literature of Greece, carried men's minds back to the writers and heroes of a distant past and so obscured the importance of the world about them. The Protestants did not claim to create a new theology but to return once more to the old ways and teachings which had prevailed in the early Church. Both of these movements, therefore, illustrate the conservative tendency of mankind and the natural respect for the past.

animals, and plants — would lead to important and useful discoveries which would greatly benefit mankind.[1]

He advocated three methods of reaching truth which are now followed by all scientific men. In the first place, he proposed that natural objects and changes should be examined with great care, in order that the observer might determine exactly what happened in any given case. This has led in modern times to incredibly refined measurement and analysis. The chemist, for example, can now determine the exact nature and amount of every substance in a cup of impure water which may appear perfectly limpid to the casual observer. Then, secondly, Roger Bacon advocated experimentation. He was not contented with mere observation of what actually happened but tried new and artificial combinations and processes. Nowadays experimentation is, of course, constantly used by scientific investigators, and by means of it they ascertain many things which the most careful observation would never reveal. Thirdly, in order to carry on investigation and make careful measurements and experiments, apparatus designed for this special purpose was found to be necessary. As early as the thirteenth century it was discovered, for example, that a convex crystal or bit of glass would magnify objects, although several centuries elapsed before the microscope and telescope were devised.

Three modern scientific methods of discovering truth

1. Exact observation of the phenomena themselves

2. Experimentation

3. Scientific apparatus

The progress of scientific discovery was hastened, strangely enough, by two grave misapprehensions, — the belief in alchemy and the confidence in astrology, both of which had been handed down from the Greeks and Romans to the scholars and investigators of the Middle Ages. Modern chemistry developed from alchemy and modern astronomy from astrology.

Alchemy and astrology

[1] He believed that huge vessels could be made to move at great speed without rowers, "that carriages can be constructed to move without animals to draw them, and with incredible velocity," that flying machines could be devised and suspension bridges be built. See Robinson, *Readings in European History*, Vol. I, p. 461.

The search for the "elixir," or philosopher's stone

The alchemist carried on his experiments with the hope of finding a so-called "elixir," or philosopher's stone, which, if added to baser metals, like lead, mercury, or even silver, should transmute them into gold. It was also believed that the same marvelous elixir would, if taken in small quantities, restore youth to the aged and prolong life indefinitely. Mysterious directions were passed on from the Greeks and Arabs which roused hope in western Europe that some of the strange substances produced in retort, crucible, and mortar would at last prove to be the potent and long-sought combination. Although no one discovered the philosopher's stone, the patient search for it brought to light curious and useful compounds which could be used in medicine and in the industries. To these picturesque names were given, such as spirits of wine and of hartshorn, cream of tartar, oil of vitriol.

The progress of chemistry was much impeded by the respect for the old idea, which even Aristotle had maintained, that there were four "elements" — earth, air, fire, and water — and that heat and cold, dryness and dampness were the fundamental qualities of matter. Even in the eighteenth century the arguments of a German chemist to prove that flame was an element which was latent in bodies until they were subjected to heat, were accepted by the greatest minds of the time. The old hopes of finding the philosopher's stone had, however, been dissipated, chiefly by the English chemist, Boyle (1626–1691).[1] New substances were discovered and the various gases, or "airs" as they were first called, were isolated: first, "inflammable air," or hydrogen, by Boyle; later carbonic acid gas, or "fixed air," and "nitrous air," or nitrogen.

[1] The impossibility of transmuting other metals into gold was first scientifically proved when it was discovered that gold was an element, or simple substance, which could not therefore be formed by any combination of other elements. Very recently, however, the strange action of the newly discovered radium and similar substances have aroused the suspicion that even the elements may some day be decomposed and perhaps transformed.

Lavoisier (1743–1794), the father of modern chemistry

Modern chemistry was not, however, really established until the latter part of the eighteenth century, when the celebrated French chemist, Lavoisier (born in 1743 and beheaded by the guillotine in 1794), during some fifteen years of experimentation, succeeded in decomposing air and in showing that combustion was really the violent combination of the oxygen in the air with any material capable of rapid oxidization. By careful weighing he showed that the products of combustion were always exactly equal to the burned substance plus the oxygen used up in the burning. It was he also who first decomposed water into oxygen and hydrogen and then recombined these gases into water. He coöperated in drawing up a new system for renaming chemical substances which was presented to the French Academy of Sciences in 1787. The names adopted — sulphates, nitrates, oxides, etc. — are still employed in our text-books of chemistry. Lavoisier's use of the balance, his successful analyses and recombinations, his correct conception of combustion and of the more important gases, enabled the chemists rapidly to multiply their discoveries and apply their knowledge to all manner of practical processes which have given us such diverse and important results as photography, the new and powerful explosives, aniline dyes, celluloid, anæsthetics, and many other potent drugs.

Astrology

Just as the false hopes of alchemy promoted the development of chemistry, so the vain hopes of forecasting the future from the stars forwarded astronomy. Until recent times, even the most intelligent persons have believed that the heavenly bodies influenced the fate of mankind; consequently, that a careful observation of the position of the planets at the time of a child's birth would make it possible to forecast his life. In the same way important enterprises were only to be undertaken when the influence of the stars was auspicious. Physicians believed that the efficacy of their medicines depended upon the position of the planets. This whole subject of the influence of the stars upon human affairs was called astrology,

and was, in some cases, taught in the mediæval universities. Those who studied the heavens gradually came, however, to the conclusion that the movements of the planets had no effect upon humanity; but the facts which the astrologers had discovered through careful observation became the basis of modern astronomy.

Idea that the earth was the center of the universe

All through the Middle Ages, even in the darkest period, learned men had known that the earth was a globe, and had not greatly underrated its size. They also knew that the planets and stars were very large and millions of miles away from the earth. But they nevertheless had a very inadequate notion of the tremendous extent of the universe. They mistakenly believed that the earth was its center and that the sun and all the heavenly host revolved about it every day. Some of the Greek thinkers had suspected that this was not

Copernicus (1473–1543)

true, but a Polish astronomer, Kopernick (commonly known by his Latinized name of Copernicus), was the first modern writer to maintain boldly that the earth and the other planets revolved about the sun. His great work, *Upon the Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies*, was published in 1543 just after his death. But he was unable to prove his theory, which was declared to be foolish and wicked by Catholics and Protestants alike, since it appeared to contradict the teachings of the Bible. Nevertheless, Copernicus opened the way for an entirely new conception of the heavenly bodies and their motions, which continued to be studied with the help of new mathematical knowledge.

Galileo and his telescope

The truths which had been only suspected by earlier astronomers were demonstrated to the eye by Galileo (1564–1642). By means of a little telescope, which was not so powerful as the best modern opera glasses, he discovered (in 1610) the spots on the sun. These made it plain that the sun was turning on its axis in the same way that astronomers were already convinced that the earth turned. His little telescope showed, too, that the moons of Jupiter were revolving about

their planet in the same way that the planets revolve about the sun.

Sir Isaac Newton and his discovery of universal gravitation

The year that Galileo died, the famous English mathematician, Isaac Newton, was born (1642–1727). He carried on the work of earlier astronomers by the application of mathematics, and proved that the force of attraction which we call gravitation was a universal one, and that the sun, the moon, the earth, and all the heavenly bodies are attracted to one another inversely as the square of the distance.

Development of the microscope

While the telescope aided the astronomer, the microscope contributed far more to the extension of practical knowledge. Rude and simple microscopes were used with advantage as early as the seventeenth century. Leuwenhoek, a Dutch linen merchant, so far improved his lenses that he discovered (1665) the blood corpuscles and the "animalculæ," or minute organisms of various kinds found in pond water and elsewhere. The microscope has been rapidly perfected since the introduction of better kinds of lenses early in the nineteenth century, so that it is now possible to magnify minute objects to more than four thousand times their diameters.

Dependence of the various sciences upon one another

It is very clear to us now that all the natural sciences are in some sort dependent upon one another. The physiologist, the physicist, the geologist, and the botanist must all know something of chemistry because they must all reckon with chemical processes at some stage of their investigations. The astronomer must know physics and mathematics and some chemistry. The psychologist must base his work upon physiology and biology.

Francis Bacon (1561 1626)

The first scholar to draw up a great scheme of all the known sciences and work out a method of research which, if conscientiously followed, promised wonderful discoveries, was Francis Bacon, a versatile English statesman and author who wrote in the time of James I. It seemed to him (as it had seemed to his namesake, Roger Bacon, three centuries earlier) that the discoveries which had hitherto been made were as nothing

compared with what could be done if men would but study and experiment with things themselves, abandon their confidence in vague words, like "moist" and "dry," "matter" and "form," and repudiate altogether "the thorny philosophy" of Aristotle which was taught in the universities. "No one," he declares, "has yet been found so firm of mind and purpose as resolutely to compel himself to sweep away all theories and common notions, and to apply the understanding, thus made fair and even, to a fresh examination of details. Thus it comes about that human knowledge is as yet a mere medley and ill-digested mass, made up of much credulity and much accident, and also of childish notions which we early have imbibed."

Founding of royal scientific academies in England, France, and Prussia

Not many years after Bacon's death, the government in England and France began to take an interest in promoting general scientific progress. The Royal Society was incorporated in London in 1662 under the king's patronage and soon began to issue its *Proceedings*, which still appear regularly. Four years later Colbert definitely organized the French Academy of Sciences. These academies — together with that founded by the Prussian king in 1700 in Berlin — by their discussions, by the publication of their proceedings, and by their encouragement and support of special investigations, have served greatly to hasten scientific progress. Colbert established the famous observatory of Paris in 1667; a few years later, 1676, the still more famous observatory at Greenwich, near London, was completed. Periodicals devoted to scientific matters began to appear. One of the very earliest and most important was the *Journal des Savants*, encouraged by Colbert, which, except for a few years during the French Revolution, has been issued regularly for well-nigh two centuries and a half.

Astronomical observatories

Scientific expeditions in the eighteenth century

Scientific expeditions to distant parts of the earth were also subsidized by the European governments, especially by France, to determine by simultaneous observations at widely distant points the exact size and shape of the globe and the distance



SIR ISAAC NEWTON

of the moon from the earth. In 1769, when Venus crossed the face of the sun, an event that would not occur again for over a hundred years, astronomers were anxious to avail themselves of this unusual opportunity with a view of calculating more exactly than ever before the distance of the sun from the earth. Accordingly various governments arranged to dispatch observers to suitable places, — the English to Hudson Bay, Tahiti, and Madras; the French to California and India; the Danes to North Cape; the Russians to Siberia. This was an early instance of what has now become an established practice in the case of any unusual astronomical event.

Discovery of natural laws

The observation and experimentation of which we have been speaking deeply influenced men's conceptions of the earth and of the universe at large. Of the many scientific discoveries, by far the most fundamental was the conviction that all things about us follow certain natural and immutable laws; and it is the determination of these laws and the seeking out of their applications to which the modern scientific investigator devotes his efforts, whether he be calculating the distance of a nebula or noting the effect of a drop of acid upon a frog's foot. He has given up all hope of reading man's fate in the stars, or of producing any results by magical processes. He is convinced that the natural laws have been found to work regularly in every instance where they have been carefully observed. Unlike the mediæval scholars, therefore, he hesitates to accept as true the reports which reach him of alleged miracles, that is, of exceptions to the general laws in which he has come to have such confidence. Moreover his study of the regular processes of nature has enabled him, as Roger Bacon foresaw,[1] to work wonders far more marvelous than any attributed to the mediæval magician.

Opposition to scientific discoveries

The path of the scientific investigator has not always been without its thorns. Mankind has changed its notions with reluctance. The churchmen and the professors in the universities

[1] See note, p. 159, above.

were wedded to the conceptions of the world which the mediæval theologians and philosophers had worked out, mainly from the Bible and Aristotle. They clung to the old books that they and their predecessors had long used in teaching, and had no desire to begin a long and painful examination of the innumerable substances and organisms from a study of which the newer scientists were gathering information that refuted the venerated theories of the past.

Hostile attitude of the theologians

The theologians were especially prone to denounce scientific discoveries on the ground that they did not harmonize with the teachings of the Bible as commonly accepted. It was naturally a great shock to them, and also to the public at large, to have it suggested that man's dwelling place, instead of being God's greatest work, to which he had subordinated everything and around which the whole starry firmament revolved, was after all but a tiny speck in comparison with the whole universe, and its sun but one of an innumerable host of similar glowing bodies of stupendous size, each of which might have its particular family of planets revolving about it.

Galileo punished for advocating new ideas

The bolder thinkers were consequently sometimes made to suffer for their ideas, and their books prohibited or burned. Galileo was forced to say that he did not really believe that the sun revolved about the earth; and he was kept in partial confinement for a time and ordered to recite certain psalms every day for three years for having ventured to question the received views in a book which he wrote in Italian, instead of Latin, so that the public at large might read it.[1]

[1] But even the scientists themselves did not always readily accept new discoveries. Francis Bacon, who lived some seventy years after Copernicus, still clung to the old idea of the revolution of the sun about the earth and still believed in many quite preposterous illusions, as for example, that "it hath been observed by the ancients that where a rainbow seemeth to hang over or to touch, there breatheth forth a sweet smell"; and that "since the ape is a merry and a bold beast, its heart worn near the heart of a man comforteth the heart and increaseth audacity." In the latter half of the eighteenth century Lavoisier was burned in effigy in Berlin because his discovery of oxygen threatened the accepted explanation of combustion.

How the Scientific Discoveries produced a Spirit of Reform

Effects of scientific discoveries on religious belief

29. Those who accepted the traditional views of the world and of religion, and opposed change, were quite justified in suspecting that scientific investigation would sooner or later make them trouble. It taught men to distrust, and even to scorn, the past which furnished so many instances of ignorance and gross superstition. Instead of accepting the teachings of the theologians, both Catholic and Protestant, that mankind through Adam's fall was rendered utterly vile, and incapable, (except through God's special grace) of good thoughts or deeds, certain thinkers began to urge that man was by nature good; that he should freely use his own God-given reason; that he was capable of becoming increasingly wise by a study of nature's laws, and that he could indefinitely better his own condition and that of his fellows if he would but free himself from the shackles of error and superstition. Those who had broadened their views of mankind and of the universe refused longer to believe that God had revealed himself only to the Jewish people, but maintained that he must be equally solicitous for all his creatures in all ages and in all parts of a boundless universe where everything was controlled by his immutable laws. This tendency to "enlarge God" is illustrated in the famous "Universal Prayer" of Alexander Pope, written about 1737:

Father of all! in ev'ry age,
  In ev'ry clime adored,
By saint, by savage, and by sage,
  Jehova, Jove, or Lord!

. . . . . .

Yet not to earth's contracted span
  Thy goodness let me bound,
Or think Thee Lord alone of man,
  When thousand worlds are 'round.

The deists

Pope was suspected of "infidelity" to the Christian religion and of rejecting the Bible as God's revelation to man, although nowadays the most devout Christian could read without offense his long poem called "An Essay on Man." But there were in his day a considerable number of "freethinkers" in England who attacked the Christian religion in no doubtful terms, and whose books were eagerly read and discussed. These "deists" maintained that their conception of God was far worthier than that of the Christian believer who, they declared, accused the deity of violating his own laws by miracles and of condemning a great part of his children to eternal torment.

How Voltaire came to England, 1726

In the year 1726 there landed in England a young and gifted Frenchman who was to become the great prophet of deism in all lands. Voltaire, who was then thirty-two years old, had already deserted the older religious beliefs and was consequently ready to follow enthusiastically the more radical of the English thinkers, who discussed matters with an openness which filled him with astonishment. He became an ardent admirer of the teachings of Newton, whose stately funeral he attended shortly after his arrival. He regarded the discoverer of universal gravitation as greater than an Alexander or a Cæsar, and did all he could to popularize Newton's work in France. "It is to him who masters our minds by the force of truth, not to those who enslave men by violence; it is to him who understands the universe, not to those who disfigure it, that we owe our reverence."

Voltaire charmed by the English freedom of speech

Voltaire was deeply impressed by the Quakers,—their simple life and their hatred of war. He was delighted with the English philosophers, especially with John Locke[1] (died in 1704);

[1] Locke rejected the notion that man was born with certain divinely implanted ideas, and maintained that we owe all that we know to the sensations and impressions which come to us from without. Locke was a man of extraordinary modesty, good sense, and caution, and he and his gifted successor, Bishop Berkeley, did much to found modern psychology by helping to rid the world of certain meaningless abstractions and encouraging the careful study of our own mental processes to which so much attention is now being given. Berkeley's *New Theory of Vision* is a clear account of the gradual way in which we learn to

he thought Pope's "Essay on Man" the finest moral poem ever composed; he admired the English liberty of speech and writing; he respected the general esteem for the merchant class. In France, he said, "the merchant so constantly hears his business spoken of with disdain that he is fool enough to blush for it; yet I am not sure that the merchant who enriches his country, gives orders from his countinghouse at Surat or Cairo, and contributes to the happiness of the globe is not more useful to a state than the thickly-bepowdered lord who knows exactly what time the king rises and what time he goes to bed, and gives himself mighty airs of greatness while he plays the part of a slave in the minister's ante-room."

Voltaire's *Letters on the English*

Voltaire proceeded to enlighten his countrymen by a volume of essays in which he set forth his impressions of England; but the high court of justice (the *parlement*) of Paris condemned these *Letters on the English* to be publicly burned, as scandalous and contrary alike to good manners and to the respect due to the principalities and powers. In this way they furnished one more illustration of the need of such men as Voltaire, who was to become, during the remainder of a long life, the chief advocate throughout Europe of unremitting reliance upon reason and of confidence in enlightenment and progress. And since a great part of the institutions of his day were not based upon reason but upon mere tradition, and were often quite opposed to common sense, "the touch of reason was fatal to the whole structure, which instantly began to crumble." His keen eye was continually discovering some new absurdity in the existing order, which, with incomparable wit and literary skill, he would expose to his eager readers. He was interested in almost everything; he wrote histories, dramas, philosophic treatises, romances, epics, and

Voltaire's wide influence and popularity

see. He shows that a blind man, if suddenly restored to sight, would make little or nothing of the confused colors and shapes which would first strike his eye. He would learn only from prolonged experience that one set of colors and contours meant a man and another a horse or a table, no matter how readily he might recognize the several objects by touch.

innumerable letters to his innumerable admirers. The vast range of his writings enabled him to bring his bold questionings to the attention of all sorts and conditions of men, — not only to the general reader, but even to the careless playgoer.

Voltaire's attack upon the Church

While Voltaire was successfully inculcating free criticism in general, he led a relentless attack upon the most venerable, probably the most powerful, institution in Europe, the Roman Catholic Church. The absolute power of the king did not trouble him, but the Church, with what appeared to him to be its deep-seated opposition to a free exercise of reason and its hostility to reform, seemed fatally to block all human progress. He was wont to close his letters with the exhortation, "Crush the infamous thing." The Church, as it fully realized, had never encountered a more deadly enemy. Not only was Voltaire supremely skillful in his varied methods of attack, but there were thousands of both the thoughtful and the thoughtless ready to applaud him; for not only was he always brilliant and entertaining in his diatribes, but many of his readers had reached the same conclusions, although they might not be able to express their thoughts so persuasively as he.[1]

Voltaire maintains that the Church should not encroach upon the functions of the State

Voltaire was scandalized not only by what he regarded as the gloomy superstition of the Church, its cruel intolerance, and the hateful conflicts over seemingly unimportant matters of belief; but he held that it exercised a pernicious control over the government. In his famous *Handy Philosophic Dictionary*, a little volume of witty essays on a variety of themes which he published anonymously in 1764, he maintains that no law of the Church should have the least force unless expressly sanctioned by the government; that all ecclesiastics should be subject to the government, should pay taxes like

[1] Voltaire repudiated the beliefs of the Protestant churches as well as of the Roman Church. He was, however, no atheist, as his enemies — and they have been many and bitter — have so often asserted. He believed in God, and at his country home near Geneva he dedicated a temple to him. Like many of his contemporaries, he was a deist, and held that God had revealed himself in nature and in our own hearts, not in Bible or Church.



VOLTAIRE

every one else, and should have no power to deprive a citizen of the least of his rights on the ground that he is a sinner, "since the priest — himself a sinner — should pray for other sinners, not judge them." Marriage should be entirely under the control of the civil government, and the shameful custom, as he calls it, of paying a part of the clergy's revenue to a "foreign priest," namely, the Pope, should no longer be maintained. But the *parlement* of Paris condemned the book to be burned, on the ground that it defended license and incredulity; that it attacked all that was sacred in religious teachings, mysteries, and authority; and that the writer gloried in sinking to the level of the brutes and dragging others down into his own degradation.

Weaknesses of Voltaire

Were there space at command, a great many good things, as well as plenty of bad ones, might be told of this extraordinary man. He was often superficial in his judgments, and sometimes jumped to unwarranted conclusions. He saw only the evil in the Church and seemed incapable of understanding all that it had done for mankind during the bygone ages. He maliciously attributed to evil motives teachings which were accepted by the best and loftiest of men. He bitterly ridiculed even the holiest and purest aspirations, along with the alleged deceptions of the Jesuits and the quarrels of the theologians.

Real greatness of Voltaire

He could, and did, however, fight bravely against wrong and oppression. The abuses which he attacked were in large part abolished by the Revolution. It is unfair to notice only Voltaire's mistakes and exaggerations, as many writers, both Catholic and Protestant, have done, for he certainly did more than any one else to prepare the way for the great and permanent reform of the Church, as a political and social institution, in 1789–1790. "When the right sense of historical proportion is more fully developed in men's minds," John Morley writes, "the name of Voltaire will stand out like the names of the great decisive movements in the European advance, like

the Revival of Learning or the Reformation. The existence, character, and career of this extraordinary person constituted in themselves a new and prodigious era."

Diderot's *Encyclopædia*

Voltaire had many admirers and powerful allies. Among these none were more important than Denis Diderot and the scholars whom Diderot induced to coöperate with him in preparing articles for a new *Encyclopædia* which should serve to spread among a wide range of intelligent readers a knowledge of scientific advance and rouse enthusiasm for reform and progress. An encyclopædia was by no means a new thing. Diderot's plan had been suggested by a proposal to publish a French translation of Chambers *Cyclopædia*.[1] Before his first volume appeared, a vast *Universal Dictionary* had been completed in Germany in sixty-four volumes. But few people outside of that country could read German in those days, whereas the well-written and popular articles of Diderot and his helpers, ranging from "abacus," "abbey," and "abdication" to "Zoroaster," "Zurich," and "zymology," were in a language that many people all over Europe could understand.

Diderot (1713–1784)

Diderot was one of the broadest, most alert and genial of the French philosophers. Like Voltaire, he had learned English and had become acquainted with the writings of Bacon, Locke, and some of the more sceptical later writers. Under their influence he prepared a little volume of *Philosophic Thoughts*, in which he urges people to dare to think for themselves, since no one should believe that he is honoring God by refusing to use his reason. He asserted that what has never been questioned has never been proved; we must doubt before we have a right to believe. Consequently scepticism, which is only legitimate doubt, leads us on to truth. "It is as hazardous to believe too much as to believe too little." The *parlement* of Paris ordered this book burned,

[1] This was first published by an English Quaker in 1727, and new editions of it still continue to appear from time to time.

and Diderot was later imprisoned for a time on account of his *Letter on the Blind for the Use of Those Who See*, in which he questioned some of the proofs usually assigned for the existence of God.

D'Alembert aids Diderot

Diderot chose for his main collaborator in preparing the *Encyclopædia*, D'Alembert, perhaps the most distinguished mathematician of his age, who was well qualified by his exactness and his special knowledge of the various fields of mathematical investigation to supplement Diderot's efforts. He lived in poverty and independence and refused invitations which came to him from Frederick the Great and later from Catharine of Russia to leave his humble surroundings for a life at court.

The *Encyclopædia* rouses the hostility of the theologians

The editors endeavored to rouse as little opposition as possible. They respected current prejudices and gave space to ideas and opinions with which they were not personally in sympathy. They furnished material, however, for refuting what they believed to be mistaken notions, and Diderot declared that "time will enable people to distinguish what we have thought from what we have said." But no sooner did the first two volumes appear in 1752 than the king's ministers, to please the Church, suppressed them, as containing principles hostile to royal authority and religion, although they did not forbid the continuation of the work. The attitude of the clergy led Diderot to exclaim angrily: "I know nothing so indecent as these vague declamations of the theologians against reason. To hear them, one would suppose that men could only enter into the bosom of Christianity as a herd of cattle enters a stable; and that we must renounce our common sense if we are either to embrace our religion or to remain in it."

D'Alembert, discouraged, leaves Diderot to complete the *Encyclopædia*

As volume after volume appeared the subscribers increased; but so did the opposition. The Encyclopædists were declared to be a band bent upon the destruction of religion and the undermining of society; the government again interfered,

withdrew the license to publish the work, and prohibited the sale of the seven volumes that were already out. D'Alembert was disheartened, and resolved to give up any attempt to carry the work further, although they had only just reached the letter "H." He wrote to Voltaire: "I am worn out with the affronts and vexations of every kind that this work draws down upon us. The hateful and even infamous satires which they print against us and which are not only tolerated but protected, authorized, applauded, nay, actually commanded, by those in power; the sermons, or rather the alarm bells, that are rung out against us at Versailles in the king's presence . . . all these reasons and some others drive me to give up this accursed work once for all." Voltaire naturally encouraged the editors to persevere. "We are on the eve of a great revolution in the human mind," he argued, "and it is you to whom we are most of all indebted." He urged Diderot to leave France and seek a country where he could complete his work in peace; but this he refused to do, for he knew that was just what his enemies desired.

Completion of the *Encyclopædia* and accompanying volumes of plates

Seven years later he was able to deliver the remaining ten volumes to the subscribers in spite of the government's prohibition. Still later eleven volumes of beautiful plates illustrating the various arts — such as weaving, printing, engraving, mining, dyeing, cabinet making, surgery — were added. In spite of the denunciation by the clergy of the completed enterprise the government refused to interfere any further.

Scope of the *Encyclopædia*

As one looks through these fine volumes, which may now and then be found in our larger libraries, he is struck with the light which they must have shed upon thousands of matters, great and small, from a lady's headdress to the constitution of the universe. The peaceful arts received especial attention. Great care was exercised in order to secure those to write for the *Encyclopædia* who really knew the details of the various trades; an inspector of glass works dealt with his particular subject, and the article on brewing was assigned to an intelligent brewer.

Value of the *Encyclopædia*

The *Encyclopædia* attacked temperately, but effectively, religious intolerance, the bad taxes, the slave trade, and the atrocities of the criminal law; it encouraged men to turn their minds to natural science with all its beneficent possibilities, and this helped to discourage the old interest in theology and barren metaphysics. The article, "Legislator," written by Diderot, says: "All the men of all lands have become necessary to one another for the exchange of the fruits of industry and the products of the soil. Commerce is a new bond among men. Every nation has an interest in these days in the preservation by every other nation of its wealth, its industry, its banks, its luxury, its agriculture. The ruin of Leipzig, of Lisbon, of Lima has led to bankruptcies on all the exchanges of Europe and has affected the fortunes of many millions of persons." The English statesman, John Morley, is doubtless right when he says, in his enthusiastic account of Diderot and his companions, that "it was this band of writers, organized by a harassed man of letters, and not the nobles swarming around Louis XV, nor the churchmen singing masses, who first grasped the great principle of modern society, the honour that is owed to productive industry. They were vehement for the glories of peace and passionate against the brazen glories of war."

Montesquieu (1689–1755) and his *Spirit of Laws*

Neither Voltaire nor Diderot had attacked the kings and their despotic system of government. Montesquieu, however, while expressing great loyalty to French institutions, opened the eyes of his fellow-citizens to the disadvantages and abuses of their government by his enthusiastic eulogy of the limited monarchy of England. In his celebrated work, *The Spirit of Laws, or the Relation which Laws should bear to the Constitution of each Country, its Customs, Climate, Religion, Commerce, etc.*, he proves from history that governments are not arbitrary arrangements, but that they are the natural products of special conditions and should meet the needs of a particular people at a particular period. England, he thought, had developed an especially happy system.

Montesquieu's doctrine of the separation of powers

Montesquieu maintained that the freedom which Englishmen enjoyed was due to the fact that the three powers of government — legislative, executive, and judicial — were not, as in France, in the same hands. Parliament made the laws, the king executed them, and the courts, independent of both, saw that they were observed. He believed that the English would lose their liberties as soon as these powers fell under the control of one person or body of persons. This principle of "the separation of powers" is now recognized in many modern governments, notably in that of the United States.

Montesquieu familiarizes Frenchmen with the advantages of the English constitution

Through Montesquieu's very readable book many thoughtful people became familiar for the first time with the English Parliament, its division into the House of Commons and the House of Lords, its annual budget which prevented the king from arbitrarily taxing his people, and the *habeas corpus* proceedings which stood in the way of his unjustly imprisoning his subjects, as the king of France could do. And there can be no doubt that English methods of government have exercised the most profound influence in bringing about the gradual reduction of the absolute powers of the monarchs upon the Continent.

Rousseau (1712–1778) attacks civilization

Next to Voltaire, the writer who did most to cultivate discontent with existing conditions was Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712†1778). Unlike Voltaire, Diderot, and D'Alembert, he believed that people thought too much, not too little; that we should trust to our hearts rather than to our heads, and may safely rely upon our natural feelings and sentiments to guide us. He declared that Europe was over-civilized, and summoned men to return to nature and simplicity. His first work was a prize essay written in 1750, in which he sought to prove that the development of the arts and sciences had demoralized mankind, inasmuch as they had produced luxury, insincerity, and arrogance. He extolled the rude vigor of Sparta and denounced the refined and degenerate life of the Athenians.

Rousseau's *Émile* deals with education

Later Rousseau wrote a book on education, called *Émile*, which is still famous. In this he protests against the efforts made by teachers to improve upon nature for, he maintains, "All things are good as their Author made them, but everything degenerates in the hands of man.... To form this rare creature, man, what have we to do? Much doubtless, but chiefly to prevent anything from being done.... All our wisdom consists in servile prejudices; all our customs are but anxiety and restraint. Civilized man is born, lives, dies in a state of slavery. At his birth he is sewed in swaddling clothes; at his death he is nailed in a coffin; as long as he preserves the human form he is fettered by our institutions."

The Social Contract

Rousseau's plea for the simple life went to the heart of many a person who was weary of complications and artificiality. Others were attracted by his firm belief in the natural equality of mankind and the right of every man to have a voice in the government. In his celebrated little treatise, *The Social Contract*, he takes up the question, By what right does one man rule over others? The book opens with the words: "Man is born free and yet is now everywhere in chains. One man believes himself the master of others and yet is after all more of a slave than they. How did this change come about? I do not know. What can render it legitimate? I believe that I can answer that question." It is, Rousseau declares, the will of the people that renders government legitimate. The real sovereign is the people. Although they may appoint a single person, such as a king, to manage the government for them, they should make the laws, since it is they who must obey them. We shall find that the first French constitution accepted Rousseau's doctrine and defined law as "the expression of the general will," — not the will of a king reigning by the grace of God.

Popular sovereignty

Beccaria (1738–1794) and his book on *Crimes and Punishments*

Among all the books advocating urgent reforms which appeared in the eighteenth century none accomplished more than a little volume by the Italian economist and jurist,

Beccaria, which exposed with great clearness and vigor the atrocities of the criminal law. The trials (even in England) were scandalously unfair and the punishments incredibly cruel. The accused was not ordinarily allowed any counsel and was required to give evidence against himself. Indeed, it was common enough to use torture to force a confession from him. Witnesses were examined secretly and separately and their evidence recorded before they faced the accused. Informers were rewarded, and the flimsiest evidence was considered sufficient in the case of atrocious crimes. After a criminal had been convicted he might be tortured by the rack, thumb screws, applying fire to different parts of his body, or in other ways, to induce him to reveal the names of his accomplices. The death penalty was established for a great variety of offenses besides murder, — for example, heresy, counterfeiting, highway robbery, even sacrilege. In England there were, according to the great jurist, Blackstone, a hundred and sixty offenses punishable with death, including cutting down trees in an orchard, and stealing a sum over five shillings in a shop, or of more than twelve pence from a person's pocket. Yet in spite of the long list of capital offenses the trials in England were far more reasonable than on the Continent, for they were public and conducted before a jury, and there was no torture used.

Unfairness of criminal trials

Cruelty of the punishments

Beccaria advocates public trials and milder but certain punishments

Beccaria advocated public trials in which the accused should be confronted by those who gave evidence against him. Secret accusations should no longer be considered. Like Voltaire, Montesquieu, and many others, he denounced the practice of torturing a suspected person with a view of compelling him by bodily anguish to confess himself guilty of crimes of which he might be quite innocent. As for punishments, he advocated the entire abolition of the death penalty, on the ground that it did not deter the evil doer as life imprisonment at hard labor would, and that in its various hideous forms — beheading, hanging, mutilation, breaking on the wheel — it was a source of demoralization to the spectators. Punishments should be less

harsh but more certain and more carefully proportioned to the danger of the offense to society. Nobles and magistrates convicted of crime should be treated exactly like offenders of the lowest class. Confiscation of property should be abolished, since it brought suffering to the innocent members of the criminal's family. It was better, he urged, to prevent crimes than to punish them, and this could be done by making the laws very clear and the punishments for their violation very certain, but above all by spreading enlightenment through better education.

The science of political economy develops in the eighteenth century

About the middle of the eighteenth century a new social science was born, namely, political economy. Scholars began to investigate the sources of a nation's wealth, the manner in which commodities were produced and distributed, the laws determining demand and supply, the function of money and credit, and their influence upon industry and commerce. Previous to the eighteenth century these matters had seemed unworthy of scientific discussion. Few suspected that there were any great laws underlying the varying amount of wheat that could be bought for a shilling, or the rate of interest that a bank could charge. The ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome had despised the tiller of the soil, the shopkeeper, and the artisan, for these indispensable members of society at that period were commonly slaves. The contempt for manual labor had decreased in the Middle Ages, but the learned men who studied theology, or pondered over Aristotle's teachings in regard to "form" and "essence," never thought of considering the effect of the growth of population upon serfdom, or of an export duty upon commerce, any more than they tried to determine why the housewife's milk soured more readily in warm weather than in cold, or why a field left fallow regained its fertility.[1]

[1] The mediæval philosophers and theologians discussed, it is true, the question whether it was right or not to charge interest for money loaned, and what might be a "just price." But both matters were considered as ethical or theological problems rather than in their economic aspects. See Ashley, *English Economic History*, Vol. I, chap. iii; Vol. II, chap. vi.

Tendency of the governments to regulate commerce and industry

Although ignorant of economic laws, the governments had come gradually to regulate more and more both commerce and industry. We have seen how each country tried to keep all the trade for its own merchants by issuing elaborate regulations and restrictions, and how the king's officers enforced the monopoly of the guilds. Indeed the French government, under Colbert's influence, fell into the habit of regulating well-nigh everything. In order that the goods which were produced in France might find a ready sale abroad, the government fixed the quality and width of the cloth which might be manufactured and the character of the dyes which should be used. The king's ministers kept a constant eye upon the dealers in grain and breadstuffs, forbidding the storing up of these products or their sale outside a market. In this way they had hoped to prevent speculators from accumulating grain in order to sell it at a high rate in times of scarcity.

Doctrines of the "mercantilists"

In short, at the opening of the eighteenth century statesmen, merchants, and such scholars as gave any attention to the subject believed that the wealth of a country could be greatly increased by government regulation and encouragement, just as in the United States to-day it is held by the majority of citizens that the government can increase prosperity and improve the conditions of the wage-earners by imposing high duties upon imported articles. It was also commonly believed that a country, to be really prosperous, must export more than it imported, so that foreign nations would each year owe it a cash balance which would have to be paid in gold or silver and in this way increase its stock of precious metals. Those who advocated using the powers of government to encourage and protect shipping, to develop colonies, and to regulate manufactures are known as "mercantilists."

Origin of the "free trade" school of economists

About the year 1700, however, certain writers in France and England reached the conclusion that the government did no good by interfering with natural economic laws which it did not understand and whose workings it did not reckon with.

They argued that the government restrictions often produced the worst possible results; that industry would advance far more rapidly if manufacturers were free to adopt new inventions instead of being confined by the government's restrictions to old and discredited methods; that, in France, the government's frantic efforts to prevent famines by making all sorts of rules in regard to selling grain only increased the distress, since even the most powerful king could not violate with impunity an economic law. So the new economists rejected the formerly popular mercantile policy. They accused the mercantilists of identifying gold and silver with wealth, and maintained that a country might be prosperous without a favorable cash balance. In short, the new school advocated "free trade." A French economist urged his king to adopt the motto, *Laissez faire* (Let things alone), if he would see his realms prosper.

Doctrines of Turgot

The leading economist of France in the eighteenth century was Turgot who, as head of the government for a brief period, made, as we shall see, an unsuccessful effort to remedy the existing abuses.[1] He argued that it would be quite sufficient if "the government should always protect the natural liberty of the buyer to buy and of the seller to sell. For the buyer being always the master to buy or not to buy, it is certain that he will select among the sellers the man who will give him at the best bargain the goods that suit him best. It is not less certain that every seller, it being his chief interest to merit preference over his competitors, will sell in general the best goods and at the lowest price at which he can make a profit in order to attract customers. The merchant or manufacturer who cheats will be quickly discredited and lose his custom without the interference of government."

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776)

The first great systematic work upon political economy was published by a Scotch philosopher, Adam Smith, in 1776. His *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of*

[1] See below, p. 219.

Nations became the basis of all further progress in the science. He attacked the doctrines of the mercantilists and the various expedients which they had favored, — import duties, bounties, restrictions upon exporting grain, etc., — all of which he believed "retard instead of accelerating the progress of society toward real wealth and greatness; and diminish instead of increasing the real value of the annual produce of its labor and land." In general he agreed with Turgot that the State should content itself with protecting traders and business men and seeing that justice was done; but he sympathized with the English navigation laws, although they obviously hampered commerce, and was not as thoroughgoing a free trader as many of the later English economists.

The economists attack existing abuses

While the economists in France and England by no means agreed in details, they were at one in believing that it was useless and harmful to interfere with what they held to be the economic laws. They brought the light of reason to bear, for example, upon the various bungling and iniquitous old methods of taxation then in vogue, and many of them advocated a single tax which should fall directly upon the landowner. They wrote treatises on practical questions, scattered pamphlets broadcast, and even conducted a magazine or two in the hope of bringing home to the people at large the existing economic evils.

The eighteenth century a period of rapidly increasing enlightenment

It is clear from what has been said that the eighteenth century was a period of unexampled advance in general enlightenment. New knowledge spread abroad by the Encyclopædists, the economists, and writers on government — Turgot, Adam Smith, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Beccaria, and many others of lesser fame — led people to see the vices of the existing system and gave them at the same time new hope of bettering themselves by abandoning the mistaken beliefs and imperfect methods of their predecessors. The spirit of reform penetrated even into kings' palaces, and we must now turn to the actual attempts to better affairs made by the more enlightened rulers of Europe.

REFERENCES

Voltaire: LOWELL, *The Eve of the French Revolution*, pp. 51–69; MORLEY, *Voltaire*.

Montesquieu: LOWELL, pp. 126–153; SOREL, *Montesquieu* (in the Great French Writers Series).

Rousseau: LOWELL, pp. 274–321; MORLEY, *Rousseau*.

The Encyclopædia: PERKINS; *France under Louis XV*, Vol. II, pp. 437–446; LOWELL, pp. 243–260; MORLEY, *Diderot and the Encyclopædists*, Vol. I.

Criminal Law in France: LOWELL, pp. 107–118.

Criminal Law in England: LECKY, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. II, chap. iv, pp. 126–138; Vol. II, chap. xxi, pp. 315–347.

The French Economists: PERKINS, Vol. II, pp. 424–437; SAY, *Turgot* (in the Great French Writers Series).

Adam Smith: HIRST, *Adam Smith* (English Men of Letters Series).

CHAPTER X

THE ENLIGHTENED DESPOTS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Reforms of Frederick II, Catharine II, Joseph II and Charles III

30. We have now described the general conditions which prevailed in western Europe in the eighteenth century, and discovered that many mediæval institutions still existed, such, for example, as the serfs, the guilds, and the privileged classes of the nobles and clergy. We have also seen how, under the influence of increasing knowledge, thoughtful men began to lose their confidence in the old customs and institutions and to demand thoroughgoing reforms. It remains to see how such reforms were attempted, and at last carried out, so that there are now few vestiges of the old system left.

The "enlightened despots"

It happened in the eighteenth century that there were several remarkably intelligent monarchs, — Frederick II of Prussia, Catharine the Great of Russia, Emperor Joseph II and his brother Leopold (grand duke of Tuscany), and Charles III of Spain. These rulers read the works of the reformers, and planned all sorts of ways in which they might better the conditions in their realms by removing old restrictions which hampered the farmer and merchant, by making new and clearer laws, by depriving the clergy of wealth and power which seemed to them excessive, and by encouraging manufactures and promoting commerce.

These monarchs are commonly known as the "enlightened" or "benevolent" despots. They were no doubt more "enlightened" than the older kings; at least they all read books and associated with learned men. But they were not more

"benevolent" than Charlemagne, or Canute, or St. Louis, or Henry IV, all of whom, as well as many other European monarchs of earlier centuries, had believed it their duty to do all they could for the welfare of their people. On the other hand, the monarchs of the eighteenth century were certainly despots in the full sense of the word. They held that all the powers of the State were vested in them, and had no idea of permitting their subjects any share in the government.

Frederick the Great, a very hard-working king

One of the most striking and practical of the reforming rulers was Frederick the Great, who maintained that the king was merely the first servant of the State. He believed that the ruler owed the State an account of the uses to which he put the taxes raised for its support and defense. He allowed the people no part in the government, it is true, but he worked very hard himself. He rose early and was busy all day. He was his own prime minister and the real head of all branches of the government, watching over the army and leading it in battle, attending to foreign affairs, guarding the finances, overseeing the courts, journeying up and down the land investigating the conduct of his officials and examining into the condition of his people.

How Frederick clung to the old system of serfdom

After the exhausting wars by which he had succeeded in rounding out his realms, Frederick bent his energies toward recruiting his wasted country. He did not approve of serfdom, and even declared that "the fact that the peasant belongs to the land and is the serf of the lord is revolting to mankind." Nevertheless he did not attempt to abolish the system. Indeed he sanctioned the old division of his subjects into three classes, — nobles, burghers, and peasants. Not only was every one bound to remain in the class in which he happened to be born but no noble was permitted to acquire burgher or peasant land; no burgher, noble or peasant land; and no peasant, noble or burgher land.

While retaining these old restrictions the king endeavored to improve the methods of farming and increased the amount

Agriculture and manufactures fostered

of agricultural land by draining the swamps. From two great marshes he recovered four hundred thousand acres upon which he had several hundred villages built. These he peopled with foreigners, for he was intent upon increasing the population by immigration. Manufactures were also fostered and Prussia began to develop some important industries.

Religious toleration in Prussia

In religious matters Frederick was extremely tolerant; he held that his subjects should be allowed to worship God freely in any way they pleased. His kingdom had long been Protestant, but there were many Catholics in parts of his scattered dominions. He welcomed Huguenots and Jesuits with equal cordiality and admitted Catholics as well as Protestants to his service. "I stand neutral between Rome and Geneva," he once said; "he who wrongs his brother of a different faith shall be punished; were I to declare for one or the other creed I should excite party spirit and persecution; my aim, on the contrary, is to show the adherents of the different churches that they are all fellow-citizens." [1]

Frederick's code furnishes a good example of benevolent despotism

Frederick found the laws of his kingdom (like those of the other European countries) in a very confused condition, — cumbersome, contradictory, and the cause of innumerable delays and constant injustice. He determined to have a new code drawn up which should establish one clear system of law for all his territories. He died before it was completed, but it was issued by his successor. It declared that the object of all government is the welfare of the people; proclaimed the right of every man to pursue his own interests so long as he did not injure any one else, and even maintained that it is the duty of the State to care for the poor and those out of work. On the other hand, it vested all the power in the king, gave to the people no part in the government, sanctioned serfdom

[1] Frederick agreed with Voltaire in his contempt for theological disputes. A clergyman of Valangin was expelled from his pulpit by his congregation because he questioned eternal punishment; when he petitioned Frederick to reinstate him, the king replied, "If my loving subjects of Valangin choose to be eternally damned it is not for me to interfere."

and the old division of the people into classes, and empowered the king to check at any moment freedom of speech and the publication of books and periodicals which were distasteful to him. Frederick's code is, in short, a picture of the benevolent despot who proclaims his anxiety to reform all things and help everybody, but who really clings to the old institutions and refuses to permit his subjects to express any opinion in regard to what should be done.

Frederick's interest in literature

In spite of his long wars and his constant attention to the duties of government, Frederick found time, as we have seen, for reading and writing books, for music and art. He built a palace near Berlin which he called *Sans Souci* where, "free from care" (as the name may be translated), he could collect his library, dine with the learned and witty men whom he chose for his companions, and play the flute. Voltaire lived with him for a time, and after his departure the king and the philosopher kept up an intimate correspondence until Voltaire's death.

Catharine II's interest in the French philosophers

Catharine II of Russia showed herself almost as interested in the philosophers and reformers as did Frederick. She invited Diderot to spend a month with her and was disappointed that d'Alembert would not consent to become the tutor of the grand duke Paul, the heir to the throne. She subscribed for the *Encyclopædia*, and bought Diderot's library when he got into trouble, permitting him to continue to use the books as long as he wished. In her frequent letters to Voltaire she explained to him her various plans for reform.

Catharine calls together a great assembly to revise the lawsof Russia (1766)

She read Montesquieu's *Spirit of Laws*, and Beccaria's *Crimes and Punishments*. Under their influence she summoned a great assembly to Moscow in 1766 which represented all the various peoples under her scepter — Russians, Tartars, Kalmucks, Cossacks, Laplanders — as well as the different classes, namely, nobles, townspeople, and peasants. She submitted to this assembly a draft of a new code of laws for Russia which she had based upon the western writers, especially

Montesquieu and Beccaria. In this she declared that "the nation is not made for the ruler but the ruler for the nation"; "liberty is the right to do anything that is not forbidden by law"; "better that ten guilty should escape than that one innocent should suffer unjust punishment." Intolerance, religious persecution, and the use of torture were condemned. When war broke out with Turkey the assembly was dismissed without finishing a task which it was, in any case, ill qualified to accomplish on account of its size and its mixed character.

Catharine maintains serfdom but secularizes the Church lands

There was some talk of abolishing serfdom in Russia, but Catharine rather increased than decreased the number of serfs and she made their lot harder than it had been before by forbidding them to complain of the treatment they received at the hands of their masters. She appropriated the vast property of the churches and monasteries, using the revenue to support the clergy and monks, and such surplus as remained she devoted to schools and hospitals.

Rash reforms of Joseph II of Austria (Emperor, 1765–1790)

It is clear that while Frederick and Catharine expressed great admiration for the reformers, they did not attempt to make any sweeping changes in the laws or the social order. Emperor Joseph II, who, after the death of his mother, Maria Theresa, in 1780, became ruler of the Austrian dominions, had

Attempt to convert the Austrian dominions into a well-organized state

however the courage of his convictions. He proposed to transform the scattered and heterogeneous territories over which he ruled into a well-organized state in which disorder, confusion, prejudice, fanaticism, and intellectual bondage should disappear and all his subjects be put in possession of their natural rights. Germans, Hungarians, Italians, Poles, Bohemians, and Belgians were all to use the German language in official communications. The old irregular territorial divisions were abolished and his realms divided up into thirteen new provinces. All the ancient privileges enjoyed by the towns and the local assemblies were done away with and replaced by a uniform system of government in which his own officials enjoyed the control.

JOSEPH II

Joseph visited France and was personally acquainted with d'Alembert, Rousseau, and Turgot. He also read with approval the work of Febronius[1] attacking the power of the Pope. So it is no wonder that, while he still claimed to be a good Catholic, he undertook a radical reform of the Church. He was heartily opposed to the monks. "The principles of monasticism," he declared, "are in flat contradiction to human reason; monks are the most useless and dangerous subjects that a country can possess." He particularly objected to those orders whose members devoted themselves to religious contemplation, which he regarded as worse than a waste of time; he consequently abolished some six hundred of their monasteries and used their property for charitable purposes and to establish schools. He appointed the bishops without consulting the Pope and forbade money to be sent to Rome. Marriage was declared to be merely a civil contract and so was taken out of the control of the priests. Lutherans, Calvinists, and other heretics were allowed to worship in their own way. Only "enlightened" professors, that is, those who sympathized with Joseph's views, were to teach in the theological schools. The Emperor's object was, in short, to free the Austrian Church from the papal control and bring it under his own. Pope Pius VI became so anxious in regard to the situation that in 1782 he actually traveled to Vienna in order to expostulate with Joseph personally. But the Emperor was firm; he forbade any one to confer with the Pope without his permission and even walled up all but one door of the palace where he was entertained and had it carefully guarded lest his Holiness should gain the ear of the people.

Joseph II reforms the Church

Joseph II sought to complete his work by attacking the surviving features of feudalism and encouraging the development of manufactures. He freed the serfs in Bohemia, Moravia, Galicia, and Hungary, transforming the peasants into tenants; elsewhere he reduced the services due from them

Joseph attacks the survivals of feudalism and encourages manufactures

[1] See above, p. 146.

to the lord. He taxed nobles and clergy without regard to their claims to exemption and supplanted the confused and uncertain laws by a uniform system which is the basis of Austrian law to-day. He introduced a protective tariff and caused a large number of factories to be built. He illustrated his preference for home industries by giving away to the hospitals all the foreign wines in his cellars, and his spirit of economy, by forbidding the use of gold and silver for candlesticks, and prohibiting the burial of the dead in coffins for the reason that this was a waste of wood which might be better employed.

Opposition to Joseph's reforms

Naturally Joseph met opposition on every hand. The clergy abhorred him as an oppressor, and all who were forced to sacrifice their old privileges did what they could to frustrate his reforms, however salutary they might be. The Netherlands, which he proposed to transform into an Austrian province, finally followed the example of the American colonies and declared themselves independent in 1790. The same year Joseph died, a sadly disappointed man, having been forced to undo almost all that he had hoped to accomplish.

Revolt of the Austrian Netherlands (1790)

Accession of Leopold II (1790–1792)

Joseph was followed by his brother Leopold who, although he had introduced important reforms in the grand duchy of Tuscany over which he had ruled, deemed it wise to restore the Austrian dominions, so far as possible, to the condition in which they were when Joseph had begun his reckless improvements. In this way he brought back the Netherlands to the Austrian fold and reassured those who had been terrified by the prospect of change.

Charles III's reforms in Spain (1759–1788)

In Italy Don Carlos, the first Bourbon king of the Two Sicilies,[1] had, like Leopold, striven to improve his very backward kingdom, and when in 1759 he became king of Spain as Charles III, he adopted the career of a reformer in earnest. He began, however, like his fellow-monarchs, by excluding the nation from all share in the government. He ignored the

[1] See above, p. 45.

national assembly, or *Cortes*, and placed the control of all branches of government in the hands of his own ministers and officials.

Manufactures and commerce

Like the other benevolent despots Charles III endeavored to increase the wealth of his kingdom by encouraging industry. Domestic manufactures were protected against foreign competition by a tariff. An agricultural college and trade schools were established, and highways, bridges, and canals were constructed. Formerly all ships coming from the American colonies had been required to land their goods either at Seville or one or two other ports. Now all the Spanish ports were thrown open to colonial commerce.

Reform of education

Scientific and economic questions began to be discussed in the newspapers and periodicals. The schools were taken out of the hands of the clergy. Modern science and philosophy were introduced into the universities of Alcala and Valencia; but that at Salamanca refused to make any change, on the ground that Aristotle was still satisfactory to all.

Charles III and the Spanish Church

In no respect were Charles's reforms more striking than in his method of dealing with the Church. There were within his realm sixty-six thousand priests and three thousand monasteries with eighty-five thousand monks. The lands of the monasteries and churches amounted to about one fifth of the entire area of Spain. The king strictly limited the right of the Church to acquire more property and subjected its lands to taxation. Although Charles III, like Joseph, regarded himself as a devout Catholic, he adhered to the principles advocated by Febronius, whose book had been translated into Spanish. He forbade any papal bull or decree to be executed before it had received his approbation, and when the Pope expostulated with him he replied that he was responsible to God alone for his acts as king.

The Inquisition

Spain had long been proud of its vigilance in defending the purity of its religion. The Inquisition, which was an ancient Church court originally established by the Pope in the middle

of the thirteenth century for the discovery and punishment of heretics, had been revived by the Spanish monarchs, Ferdinand and Isabella, in 1483, with a view of purging their kingdoms of the religious errors of the numerous Jews and Moors, and it had developed into a great national institution. Thousands and thousands were convicted by this tribunal of holding false beliefs, uttering blasphemies, or practicing forbidden arts like sorcery or magic, and were condemned to be burned, whipped, imprisoned, or sent to the galleys.[1] While the Inquisition was no longer so active in the eighteenth century as it had once been, no less than fourteen thousand persons are said to have been convicted by it of more or less grave offenses during the reign of the Bourbon king, Philip V, and nearly eight hundred of these were burned alive. Charles III thought that the Inquisition contributed materially to the maintenance of public morals by condemning wrong teachings and books which were indecent or which attacked the government or religion. He did not, therefore, abolish it, but there were only four persons sent to the stake during his reign.

The expulsion of the Jesuits begun by Portugal (1759)

On one matter most of the Catholic monarchs were in hearty agreement; they were all opposed to the Jesuits, who had become increasingly unpopular during the eighteenth century. They had aroused the hostility of the kings by exalting the power of the Pope and they had excited the enmity of the merchant class by their success in carrying on trade with India and the New World. The first country to expel the Jesuits was Portugal, where they were accused of stirring up disorder

[1] In order to impress the people with the horror of heresy and the majesty of the Inquisition, the sentencing of those guilty of heresy was made a gorgeous public ceremony held in a great square "for the glory of God and the exaltation of our holy Catholic faith." Everything was arranged to terrify and humiliate the victims. For example, those who were to be burned wore miters and yellow cloaks adorned with flames. These *autos-da-fé*, or "acts of faith," were regarded as a pious and fitting form of celebrating the advent of a new monarch. The last great public *auto-da-fé* was held in Madrid in 1680 to celebrate the marriage of Charles II. The first French king, Philip V, refused to be present at a similar performance proposed for him and it was given up. Thereafter the *autos-da-fé* were held in churches and became less and less important.

and plotting the death of the king. In 1759 large numbers of them were loaded on to ships and sent to the papal dominions, while others were imprisoned. The property of the order was confiscated.

Dissolution of the order of Jesuits in France

In France the quarrel between the Jesuits and the Jansenists — a party which clung to the Gallican liberties[1] — had been long and bitter. About the middle of the eighteenth century an association was formed by the enemies of the Jesuits for the express purpose of publishing pamphlets denouncing them and their teachings and rousing public opinion against them. Matters were brought to a crisis by the failure of a great Jesuit commercial house in Martinique. Its creditors declared the whole order responsible for the losses involved and the case reached the *parlement* of Paris, the chief French court. When the lawyer representing the Jesuits argued that their property should be protected on the ground that it was used to train youths in piety and learning, he was greeted with jeers from the crowd in the court room. The *parlement* decided against

[1] See above, p. 146. The Jansenists derived their name from a theologian, Cornelius Jansen, who wrote a long Latin treatise upon the teachings of St. Augustine. This contained certain doctrines resembling those of Calvin, although Jansen believed himself a devout Catholic and submitted all that he said to the judgment of the Pope. The Jesuits attacked the work when it appeared in 1640 and the Pope forbade the reading of the *Augustinus*. Nevertheless a party adhered to the teachings of Jansen, and one of their number, the famous Pascal, attacked the Jesuits in his *Provincial Letters*, which is regarded as a French classic. After interminable discussions, the Pope, urged by the Jesuits, issued the important bull "Unigenitus" in 1713 in which he condemned one hundred and one propositions of a Jansenist work, — *Moral Reflections* by Quesnel, a prominent Jansenist. This led to forty years of disturbance, for the Pope ordered those to be cast out of the Church who refused to accept the "Unigenitus." A part of the clergy accepted the bull but others refused to do so and were supported in their opposition by the king's courts; for many of the judges were Jansenists, or, at any rate, hated the Jesuits on account of their ultramontane views. Finally, in 1752, a priest refused to perform the last sacraments in the case of a man accused of Jansenism. Other priests who had accepted the bull declined to perform the funeral services for those who rejected it and bodies remained unburied, to the scandal and disgust of the community. This long struggle within the French Church, which did not come to an end until 1756, prepared the way for the abolition in France of the Jesuits, and helped to discredit religion in the minds of those who read the writings of Voltaire, Diderot, and the other philosophers.

the Jesuits, ordered an investigation of their alleged pernicious teachings, and in 1762 dissolved the order on account of the perversity of their conduct and doctrines. Louis XV reluctantly ratified this measure two years later and the Jesuits, to the number of four thousand, ceased to form an order in France, although they were permitted to remain in the country as individuals.

The Spanish and Italian Bourbons suppress the order and induce the Pope to abolish it (1773)

Three years later Charles III of Spain followed the example set by Portugal and France and abolished the order in Spain without giving any reasons. He ordered the Jesuits to be taken to the seacoast and shipped to the papal dominions. After the king of the Two Sicilies and the duke of Parma had also suppressed the order in their realms, all the various Bourbon rulers combined to induce the Pope to complete their work by putting an end to the Society of Jesus throughout Christendom. This he most reluctantly consented to do. In 1773 Clement XIV issued the bull "Dominus ac redemptor," in which he confessed that the order no longer performed the services for which it had been founded, that it roused innumerable complaints by mixing in politics, and that its continued existence was an obstacle in the way of a good understanding between the Pope and the House of Bourbon. He accordingly abolished the society, permitting its members to enter other orders or to become ordinary priests.[1] At the time when the attack on the Jesuits began the society numbered 22,589 members and maintained nearly 800 colleges and seminaries and 270 mission stations.

Summary of the activities of the benevolent despots

It has become clear, as we have reviewed the activities of the various benevolent despots, that all of them were chiefly intent upon increasing their own power; they were more despotic than they were benevolent. They opposed the interference of the Pope and brought the clergy under their own control. In some cases they took a portion of the property of the churches and monasteries. They tried to improve the laws

[1] For the bull itself, see *Readings*, sect. 30.

and do away with the existing contradictions and obscurities. They endeavored to "centralize" the administration and to place all the power in the hands of their own officials instead of leaving it with the nobles or the old local assemblies. They encouraged agriculture, commerce, and industries in various ways. All of these measures were undertaken primarily with a view to strengthening the autocratic power of the ruler and augmenting the revenue and the military strength of his government, for none of these energetic monarchs showed any willingness to admit the people to a share in the government, and only Joseph II ventured to attempt to free the serfs.

Peculiarities of the English Government in the Eighteenth Century

Parliament holds the purse strings

31. The government of England in the eighteenth century differed in many respects from that which prevailed across the Channel. Frederick the Great and Louis XV could fix the amount of the taxes and decide who should pay them without asking the consent, or even the advice, of any of their subjects. They could borrow all the money that the bankers would lend them and spend it as they pleased, without giving any account of it. The English king, on the contrary, could impose no taxes and borrow no money on the national credit without the sanction of Parliament; and a definite sum was assigned to him as an allowance with which to keep up his royal establishment, defray his personal expenses, and pay the salaries of important government officials.

Parliament controls lawmaking

The benevolent despots, as we have seen, made any change they wished in the laws by a simple edict. In England the king could neither issue a new law nor suspend an old one without the consent of Parliament. Even the right which he had formerly enjoyed to veto the bills passed by Parliament fell into disuse and was exercised for the last time by Queen Anne in 1707.

The king of England did not control the courts of law

On the Continent the monarch could remove judges who made decisions which did not please him. In England, since 1701, the judges have held their positions during good behavior, unless removed on request of both houses of Parliament. The English king could not arbitrarily arrest his subjects or call before his own council, to be decided by himself personally, cases which were being tried in the regular courts. The Habeas Corpus Act of 1679 provided that any one who was arrested should be informed of the reason and should be speedily tried by a regular tribunal and dealt with according to the law of the land. In France there were none of these restrictions placed upon the king, who could arrest his subjects on *lettres de cachet*, imprison them indefinitely without assigning a reason, and could interfere in any suit and decide it as he chose.

Contrast between the English Parliament and similar bodies on the Continent

The English Parliament, which had originated in the thirteenth century, was by no means unique in the Middle Ages. For example, we find the king of Aragon summoning an assembly of nobles, clergy, and "rich men" as early as 1162. In 1255 the representatives of the cities appeared in the diet of the Holy Roman Empire along with the various princes and prelates. In France, about 1300, the Estates General had come to be made up of representatives of the three classes of the realm, — nobles, clergy, and the "third estate," or townspeople.

The two houses of Parliament

But all these bodies, and others of the same kind, gradually lost all their importance with the sole exception of the English Parliament. This had from the middle of the fourteenth century consisted of two houses. The higher nobility — dukes, marquises, earls, viscounts, and barons — sat, together with the prelates, — archbishops, bishops, and abbots[1] — in the House of Lords. Accordingly the representatives of the nobles and the clergy were not separated as they often were on the Continent. In the second chamber, the House of Commons, there were not only representatives of the towns but those chosen by

[1] The abbots disappeared when Henry VIII dissolved the monasteries.

the landed proprietors of the counties, — thus giving the lesser landholders a voice in the nation's councils.[1]

The House of Commons represented only a small part of the nation

Remarkable as was the English Parliament in the eighteenth century, in its organization and its power to control the king, it nevertheless represented only a small part of the nation. In the Middle Ages, when the towns were small and the country population tolerably evenly scattered, the House of Commons fairly represented the property owners throughout England. But as time went on no effort was made to readjust the apportionment to meet the changes which gradually took place. Many towns dwindled away, some disappeared altogether, and the lords upon whose lands they had been situated came to control the choice of those members of the House of Commons who represented these so-called "rotten boroughs." On the other hand, great towns like Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds grew up, which had no representatives. As a result the great majority of the English people had no more share in the government than the subjects of Louis XV. In 1768 there were only one hundred and sixty thousand voters, although the whole population of Great Britain amounted to some eight millions; that is to say, about one in every ten adult males had a voice in the government. Moreover, no poor man could sit in Parliament, since all members were required to hold considerable land.[2]

Origin of the Tories and Whigs

Despite the small number who could actually participate in the choice of representatives, political questions were hotly discussed among the upper classes, who were divided into two well-defined parties, Tories and Whigs. These owed their origin to the excitement of the Civil War, when those who supported Charles I were called Cavaliers and those who opposed him, Roundheads. During the latter years of Charles II,

[1] The lower clergy was not represented in Parliament as it was in the Estates General. For a time its representatives met and voted the taxes that they were to pay, but after 1664 the assembly confined itself exclusively to religious matters.

[2] For a fuller description of the parliamentary system and its reform, see below, chap. xxv.

the former party, which upheld the divine right of kings and the supremacy of the Anglican Church, received the name of "Tory." Their opponents, who advocated the supremacy of Parliament and championed toleration for the Dissenters, came to be called Whigs.[1]

Whig supremacy in the early eighteenth century

After the death of Anne, many of the Tories favored calling to the throne the son of James II (popularly called "the old Pretender"), whereupon the Whigs succeeded in discrediting their rivals by denouncing them as Jacobites[2] and traitors. They made the new Hanoverian king, George I,[3] believe that he owed everything to the Whigs, and for a period of nearly fifty years, under George I and George II, they were able to control Parliament. George I himself spoke no English, was ignorant of English politics, and was much more interested in Hanover than in his new kingdom. He did not attend the meetings of his ministers, as his predecessors had done, and turned over the management of affairs to the Whig leaders. They found a skillful "boss" and a judicious statesman in Sir Robert Walpole, who maintained his own power and that of his party by avoiding war and preventing religious dissensions at home. He used the king's funds to buy the votes necessary to maintain the Whig majority in the House of Commons and for getting his measures through that body. He was England's first "prime minister."

Robert Walpole, prime minister (1721–1742)

Origin of the cabinet

The existence of two well-defined political parties standing for widely different policies forced the king to choose all his ministers from either one or the other. The more prominent among his advisers came gradually to form a little group which resigned together if Parliament refused to accept the measures they advocated. So the English rulers from the time of William III were generally compelled to select their ministers

[1] Not until after the reform of 1832 did the Tories become "Conservatives" and the Whigs assume the name of "Liberals."

[2] This name applied to the supporters of James is derived from the Latin form of his name, *Jacobus*.

[3] See above, p. 48.

from the party which had a majority in Parliament; otherwise their plans would be pretty sure to be frustrated. In this way "cabinet government" originated, that is, government by a small group of the heads of departments (like the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the First Commissioner of the Admiralty, etc.) who belong to the party which has a majority in Parliament, or at least in the House of Commons, and who resign together when the House votes down any measure which they propose.

Walpole acknowledges his dependence upon the House of Commons

Walpole secured a cabinet which he could control and declared that it, not the king, was really responsible for the whole conduct of the government while its members remained in office. Moreover, he frankly confessed that he owed his power not to the king but to the House of Commons. In a debate there he said: "I have lived long enough to know that the safety of a minister lies in having the approbation of this house. Formerly, ministers neglected this and fell; I have always made it my first study to obtain it and therefore I hope to stand." On another occasion he said, "When I speak here as a minister I speak as possessing my powers from his Majesty, but as being answerable to this house for the exercise of those powers." And so it came about that Parliament acquired the right not only to grant taxes and make laws but actually to force the king to turn over the conduct of the government to ministers who enjoyed its approval.

King George III bribes the Commons when necessary

Nevertheless after Walpole's fall in 1742 cabinet government did not flourish for a generation or so, especially under George III, who came to the throne in 1760, for he proposed to follow his mother's advice, "George, be king." Indeed many thoughtful men felt that Walpole had been what we should call nowadays a corrupt boss, and accordingly they encouraged the king to keep the government in his own hands. During the war with the American colonies George III was practically his own prime minister and freely resorted to what he called

"golden pills" to cure those who opposed him and to gain a majority in the House of Commons.

General interest in politics aroused

George III, in spite of his exalted notion of his royal prerogatives, could not revive any general enthusiasm for absolute monarchy. Indeed, during the latter half of the eighteenth century the people at large began to pay especial attention to political questions, to draw up petitions,[1] and hold monster meetings in which they demanded that all adult males, rich and poor alike, should be permitted to vote for members of the House of Commons.

John Wilkes and his *North Briton*

The newspapers, which had become common in England as the eighteenth century advanced, freely discussed politics in a way absolutely unknown on the Continent. John Wilkes, the editor of the *North Briton*, who held that the members of Parliament were merely delegates of the people and were, like the ministers, accountable to them, ventured in 1763 to describe George III's speech at the opening of Parliament as "the most abandoned instance of political effrontery." This enraged the king and his ministers who, while they could not shut up the obnoxious journalist as Louis XV would have done, had him prosecuted for libel in a regular court. Though Wilkes was found guilty of the charge, his cause was so popular that riots broke out in his favor. He stood for Parliament and was elected twice by a large majority but was expelled both times and not allowed to take his seat until the excitement had died away.

Growing demand for reform

The real victory was therefore with Wilkes, and except in times of danger the government did not seriously interfere with political criticism. There was accordingly an increasing number of writers to point out to the people the defects in the

[1] Dr. Johnson declared that every politician who lost his office got signatures to a petition attacking the policy of the ministers who dismissed him. "One man signs because he hates the papists, another because he had vowed destruction to the turnpikes; one because it will vex the parson, another because he owes his landlord nothing; one because he is rich, another because he is poor; one to show that he is not afraid, and another to show that he can write."

English system. They urged that every man should have the right to participate in the government by casting his vote, and that the constitution should be written and so made clear and unmistakable. Political clubs were founded which entered into correspondence with political societies in France; newspapers and pamphlets poured from the press in enormous quantities, and political reform found champions in the House of Commons. Even so influential a politician as the younger Pitt, who was prime minister from 1783 to 1801, introduced bills into the House of Commons for remedying some inequalities in representation. But the violence and disorder which accompanied the French Revolution involved England in a long and tedious war and discredited reform with Englishmen who had formerly favored change, to say nothing of the Tories, who regarded with horror any proposal to modify the venerated English constitution.

The younger Pitt

It is clear that England possessed the elements of a modern free government, for her king was master neither of the persons nor the purses of his subjects, nor could he issue arbitrary laws. Political affairs were discussed in newspapers and petitions so that weighty matters of government could not be decided secretly in the king's closet without the knowledge of his subjects. Nevertheless it would be far from correct to regard the English system as democratic. The mass of the people had no political rights whatever; an hereditary House of Lords could block any measure introduced in the House of Commons; and the House of Commons itself represented not the nation but a small minority of landowners and traders. Government offices were monopolized by members of the Established Church and the poor were oppressed by cruel criminal laws administered by officials chosen by the king. Workingmen were prohibited from forming associations to promote their interests. It was more than a century after the accession of George III before the English peasant could go to the ballot box and vote for members of Parliament.

England had already the elements of a modern free government, but the political system was not democratic

REFERENCES

Frederick the Great: HENDERSON, *A Short History of Germany*, Vol. II, chap. v, pp. 182–218.

Reforms of Catharine the Great: RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, Vol. II, chap. x, pp. 203–220.

Joseph II and Austria: FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 15–20; HASSALL, *Balance of Power* (European History, 1715–1789), pp. 357–366.

Charles III of Spain: HASSALL, pp. 287–289.

Enlightened Despotism in Portugal and Italy: HASSALL, pp. 291–294.

Dissolution of the Jesuit Order: HASSALL, pp. 294–301; PERKINS, *France under Louis XV*, Vol. II, pp. 206–225.

Walpole and the Cabinet System: MORLEY, *Walpole* (English Statesmen Series), pp. 139–165; LECKY, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. I, chap. iii, pp. 364–437.

The English Parliament: LECKY, Vol. II, chap. iv, pp. 45–63; MAY, *Constitutional History of England*, chaps. v and vi.

Political Parties in England: LECKY, Vol. I, chap. ii, pp. 212–270; MAY, chap. viii.

CHAPTER XI

THE EVE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

THE *ANCIEN RÉGIME* IN FRANCE

32. The benevolent despots had not succeeded in ridding Europe of the old institutions and confusion which had come down from the Middle Ages, — indeed, there were many things which they had no desire to change. Even in England little was done in the eighteenth century to meet the most reasonable demands of the reformers. But in 1789 the king of France asked his people to submit their grievances to him and to send representatives to Versailles to confer with him upon the state of the realm and the ways in which the government might be improved so as to increase the general happiness and the prosperity of the kingdom. And then the miracle happened! The French National Assembly swept away the old abuses with an ease and thoroughness which put the petty reforms of the benevolent despots to shame. It accomplished more in a few months than the reforming kings had done in a century; for the kings had never dreamed of calling in their people to aid them. Instead of availing themselves of the great forces of the nation, they had tried to do everything alone by royal decrees, and so had failed.

How the French people accomplished reforms which had foiled the benevolent despots

The unique greatness of the reformation accomplished by the French Assembly is, however, often obscured by the disorder which accompanied it. When one meets the words "French Revolution," he is pretty sure to call up before his mind's eye the storming of the Bastille, the guillotine and its hundreds of victims, and the Paris mob shouting the hymn of the Marseillaise as they parade the streets with the heads of unfortunate "aristocrats" on their pikes. Every one has heard of this

The real French Revolution not to be confused with the Reign of Terror

terrible episode in French history, even if he knows practically nothing of the permanent good which was accomplished at the time. Indeed, it has made so deep an impression on posterity that the Reign of Terror is often mistaken for the real Revolution. It was, however, only a sequel to it, an unhappy accident which will seem less and less important as the years go on, while the achievements of the Revolution itself will loom larger and larger. The Reign of Terror will be explained and described in good time, but it is a matter of far greater importance to understand clearly how the fundamental and permanent reforms were wrought out, and how France won the proud distinction of being the first nation to do away with the absurd and vexatious institutions which weighed upon Europe in the eighteenth century.

Meaning of the term *Ancien Régime*

We have already examined these institutions which were common to most of the European countries, — despotic kings, arbitrary imprisonment, unfair taxation, censorship of the press, serfdom, feudal dues, friction between Church and State, — all of which the reformers had been busy denouncing as contrary to reason and humanity, and some of which the benevolent despots and their ministers had, in a half-hearted way, attempted to remedy. The various relics of bygone times and of outlived conditions which the Revolution abolished forever are commonly called in France the *Ancien Régime* (the old system). In order to see why France took the lead of other European countries in modernizing itself, it is necessary to examine somewhat carefully the particular causes of discontent there. We shall then see how almost every one, from the king to the peasant, came to realize that the old system was bad and consequently resolved to do away with it and substitute a more rational plan of government for the long-standing disorder.

France not a well-organized state in the eighteenth century

Of the evils which the Revolution abolished, none was more important than the confusion due to the fact that France was not in the eighteenth century a well-organized, homogeneous

state whose citizens all enjoyed the same rights and privileges. A long line of kings had patched it together, adding bit by bit as they could. By conquest and bargain, by marrying heiresses, and through the extinction of the feudal dynasties, the original restricted domains of Hugh Capet about Paris and Orleans had been gradually increased by his descendants. We have seen how Louis XIV gained Alsace and Strassburg and some towns on the borders of the Spanish Netherlands, how Louis XV added Lorraine on the death of his father-in-law in 1766. Two years later the island of Corsica was ceded to France by Genoa. So when Louis XVI came to the throne in 1774 he found himself ruler of practically the whole territory which makes up France to-day.

The old provinces of France

Some of the districts which the kings of France brought under their sway, like Languedoc, Provence, Brittany, and Dauphiny, were considerable states in themselves, each with its own laws, customs, and system of government. When these provinces had come, at different times, into the possession of the king of France, he had not changed their laws so as to make them correspond with those of his other domains. He was satisfied if a new province paid its due share of the taxes and treated his officials with respect. In some cases the provinces retained their local assemblies, and controlled, to a certain extent, their own affairs. The provinces into which France was divided before the Revolution were not, therefore, merely artificial divisions created for the purposes of administrative convenience, like the modern French departments,[1] but represented real historical differences.

Various systems of law

While in a considerable portion of southern France the Roman law still prevailed, in the central parts and in the west and north there were no less than two hundred and eighty-five different local codes of law in force; so that one who moved from his own to a neighboring town might find a wholly unfamiliar legal system.

[1] See below, p. 238

Interior customs lines

Neither was France commercially a single state. The chief customs duties were not collected upon goods as they entered French territory from a foreign country; for the customs lines lay within France itself, so that the central provinces about Paris were cut off from the outlying ones as from a foreign



The Provinces of France in the Eighteenth Century, showing Interior Customs Lines

land. A merchant of Bordeaux sending goods to Paris would have to see that the duties were paid on them as they passed the customs line, and, conversely, a merchant of Paris would have to pay a like duty on commodities sent to places without the line.

The monstrous inequalities in levying one of the oldest and heaviest of the taxes, i.e. the salt tax, still better illustrate

the strange disorder that existed in France in the eighteenth century. The government collected this form of revenue by monopolizing the sale of salt and then charging a high price for it. There would have been nothing remarkable in this had the same price been charged everywhere, but as it was, the

Inequalities of taxation illustrated by the salt tax



Map showing the Amount paid in the Eighteenth Century for Salt in Various Parts of France [1]

people in one town might be forced to pay thirty times as much as their neighbors in an adjacent district. The accompanying map shows how arbitrarily France was divided. To take a single example: in the city of Dijon a certain amount of salt cost seven francs; a few miles to the east, on entering

[1] The figures indicate the various prices of a given amount of salt.

Franche-Comté, one had to pay for the same amount twenty-five francs; a little to the north, fifty-eight francs; to the south, in the region of the little salt tax, twenty-eight francs; while still farther off, in Gex, there was no tax whatever. The government had to go to great expense to guard the boundary lines between the various districts, for there was every inducement to smugglers to carry salt from those parts of the country where it was cheap into the land of the great salt tax.

The privileged classes

Besides these unfortunate local differences, there were class differences which caused great discontent. All Frenchmen did not enjoy the same rights as citizens. Two small but very important classes, the nobility and the clergy, were treated differently by the State from the rest of the people. They did not have to pay one of the heaviest of the taxes, the notorious *taille;* and on one ground or another they escaped other burdens which the rest of the citizens bore. For instance, they were not required to serve in the militia or help build the roads.

The Church

We have seen how great and powerful the mediæval Church was. In France, as in other Catholic countries of Europe, it still retained in the eighteenth century a considerable part of the power that it had possessed in the thirteenth, and it still performed important public functions. It took charge of education and of the relief of the sick and the poor. It was very wealthy and is supposed to have owned one fifth of all the land in France. The clergy claimed that their property, being dedicated to God, was not subject to taxation. They consented, however, to help the king from time to time by a "free gift," as they called it. The Church still collected the tithes from the people, and its vast possessions made it very independent. It will be remembered that those who did not call themselves Roman Catholics were excluded from some of the most important rights of citizenship. Since the revocation of the Edict of Nantes no Protestant could be legally married, or have the births of his children registered, or make a legal will.

The clergy

A great part of the enormous income of the Church went to the higher clergy, — the bishops, archbishops, and abbots. Since these were appointed by the king,[1] often from among his courtiers, they paid but little attention to their duties as officers of the Church and were generally nothing more than "great lords with a hundred thousand francs income." While they amused themselves at Versailles the real work was performed — and well performed — by the lower clergy, who often received scarcely enough to keep soul and body together. This explains why, when the Revolution began, the parish priests sided with the people instead of with their ecclesiastical superiors.

The privileges of the nobility

The privileges of the nobles, like those of the clergy, had originated in the mediæval conditions described in an earlier chapter.[2] A detailed study of their rights would reveal many survivals of the institutions which prevailed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the great majority of the people were serfs living upon the manors. While serfdom had largely disappeared in France long before the eighteenth century, and the peasants were generally free men who owned or rented their land, it was still the theory of the French law that there was "no land without its lord." Consequently the lords still enjoyed the right to collect a variety of time-honored dues from the inhabitants living within the limits of the former manors.

The feudal dues

The privileges and dues enjoyed by the nobles varied greatly in different parts of France. It was quite common for the noble landowner to have a right to a certain portion of the peasant's crops; occasionally he could still collect a toll on sheep and cattle driven past his house. In some cases the lord maintained, as he had done in the Middle Ages, the only mill, wine press, or oven within a certain district, and could require every

[1] According to the agreement made by Francis I with the Pope in 1516. See above, p. 141.

[2] See above, sects. 24 and 25.

one to make use of these and pay him a share of the product. Even when a peasant owned his land, the neighboring lord usually had the right to exact one fifth of its value every time it was sold.

The hunting rights

The nobles, too, enjoyed the exclusive privilege of hunting, which was deemed an aristocratic pastime. The game which they preserved for their amusement often did great damage to the crops of the peasants, who were forbidden to interfere with hares and deer. Many of the manors had great pigeon houses, built in the form of a tower, in which there were one or two thousand nests. No wonder the peasants detested these, for they were not permitted to protect themselves against the innumerable pigeons and their progeny, which spread over the fields devouring newly sown seed. These dovecotes constituted, in fact, one of the chief grievances of the peasants.

Offices at court and in the Church and army reserved for nobles

The higher offices in the army were reserved for the nobles, as well as the easiest and most lucrative places in the Church and about the king's person. All these privileges were vestiges of the powers which the nobles had enjoyed when they ruled their estates as feudal lords. Louis XIV had, as we know, induced them to leave their domains and gather round him at Versailles, where all who could afford it lived for at least a part of the year.

Only a small part of the nobles belonged to old families

Only a small part of the nobility in the eighteenth century were, however, descendants of the ancient and illustrious feudal families of France. The greater part of them had been ennobled in recent times by the king, or had purchased or inherited a government office or judgeship which carried the privileges of nobility with it. This fact rendered the rights and exemptions claimed by the nobility even more odious to the people at large than they would otherwise have been.

The third estate

Everybody who did not belong to either the clergy or nobility was regarded as being of the third estate. The third estate was therefore nothing more than the nation at large, which was made up in 1789 of about twenty-five million souls. The

privileged classes can scarcely have counted altogether more than two hundred or two hundred and fifty thousand individuals. A great part of the third estate lived in the country and tilled the soil. Most historians have been inclined to make out their condition as very wretched. They were certainly oppressed by an abominable system of taxation and were irritated by the dues which they had to pay to the lords. They also suffered frequently from local famines. Yet there is no doubt that the evils of their situation have been greatly exaggerated. When Thomas Jefferson traveled through France in 1787 he reports that the country people appeared to be comfortable and that they had plenty to eat. Arthur Young, a famous English traveler who has left us an admirable account of his journeys in France during the years 1787 and 1789, found much prosperity and contentment, although he gives, too, some forlorn pictures of destitution.

Favorable situation of the peasant in France compared with other countries

The latter have often been unduly emphasized by historical writers; for it has commonly been thought that the Revolution was to be explained by the misery and despair of the people, who could bear their burdens no longer. If, however, instead of comparing the situation of the French peasant under the old régime with that of an English or American farmer to-day, we contrast his position with that of his fellow-peasant in Prussia, Russia, Austria, Italy, or Spain, in the eighteenth century, it will be clear that in France the agricultural classes were really much better off than elsewhere on the Continent. In almost all the other European countries, except England, the peasants were still serfs: they had to work certain days in each week for their lord; they could not marry or dispose of their land without his permission. Moreover the fact that the population of France had steadily increased from seventeen millions after the close of the wars of Louis XIV to about twenty-five millions at the opening of the Revolution, indicates that the general condition of the people was improving rather than growing worse.

Rapid increase of population in the eighteenth century

Popular discontent, not the exceptionally miserable condition of the French people, accounts for the Revolution

The real reason why France was the first among the European countries to carry out a great reform and do away with the irritating survivals of feudalism was not that the nation was miserable and oppressed above all others, but that it was sufficiently free and enlightened to realize the evils and absurdities of the old régime. Mere oppression and misery does not account for a revolution; there must also be active *discontent;* and of that there was a great abundance in France, as we shall see. The French peasant no longer looked up to his lord as his ruler and protector, but viewed him as a sort of legalized robber who demanded a share of his precious harvest, whose officers awaited the farmer at the crossing of the river to claim a toll, who would not let him sell his produce when he wished, or permit him to protect his fields from the ravages of the pigeons which it pleased his lord to keep.

France still a despotism in the eighteenth century

In the eighteenth century France was still the despotism that Louis XIV had made it. Louis XVI once described it very well in the following words: "The sovereign authority resides exclusively in my person. To me solely belongs the power of making the laws, and without dependence or coöperation. The entire public order emanates from me, and I am its supreme protector. My people are one with me. The rights and interests of the nation are necessarily identical with mine and rest solely in my hands." In short, the king still ruled "by the grace of God," as Louis XIV had done. He needed to render account to no man for his governmental acts; he was responsible to God alone. The following illustrations will make clear the dangerous extent of the king's power.

The king's control of the government funds

In the first place, it was he who levied each year the heaviest of the taxes, the hated *taille,* from which the privileged classes were exempted. This tax brought in about one sixth of the whole revenue of the State. The amount collected was kept secret, and no report was made to the nation of what was done with it or, for that matter, with any other part of the

king's income. Indeed no distinction was made between the king's private funds and the State treasury, whereas in England the monarch was given a stated allowance. The king of France could issue as many drafts payable to bearer as he wished; the royal officials must pay all such orders and ask no questions. Louis XV is said to have spent no less than seventy million dollars in this irresponsible fashion in a single year.

Lettres de cachet

But the king not only controlled his subjects' purses; he had a terrible authority over their persons as well. He could issue orders for the arrest and arbitrary imprisonment of any one he pleased. Without trial or formality of any sort a person might be cast into a dungeon for an indefinite period, until the king happened to remember him again or was reminded of him by the poor man's friends. These notorious orders of arrest were called *lettres de cachet*, i.e. sealed letters. They were not difficult to obtain for any one who had influence with the king or his favorites, and they furnished a particularly easy and efficacious way of disposing of an enemy. These arbitrary orders lead one to appreciate the importance of the provision of Magna Carta which runs: "No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned except by the lawful judgment of his peers and in accordance with the law of the land." Some of the most eminent men of the time were shut up by the king's order, often on account of books or pamphlets written by them which displeased the king or those about him. The distinguished statesman, Mirabeau, when a young man, was imprisoned several times through *lettres de cachet* obtained by his father as a means of checking his reckless dissipation.

Limitations on the power of the French king

Yet, notwithstanding the seemingly unlimited powers of the French king, and in spite of the fact that France had no written constitution and no legislative body to which the nation sent representatives, the monarch was by no means absolutely free to do just as he pleased. He had not the time nor inclination to carry on personally the government of twenty-five million subjects, and he necessarily, and willingly, left much of the

work to his ministers and the numerous public officials, who were bound to obey the laws and regulations established for their control and guidance.

The *parlements* and their protests

Next to the king's council the most important governmental bodies were the higher courts of law, the *parlements*. These resembled the English Parliament in almost nothing but name. The French *parlements* — of which the most important one was at Paris and a dozen more were scattered about the provinces — did not, however, confine themselves solely to the business of trying lawsuits. They claimed, and quite properly, that when the king decided to make a new law he must send it to them to be registered, for how, otherwise, could they adjust their decisions to it? Now although they acknowledged that the right to make the laws belonged to the monarch, they nevertheless often sent a "protest" to the king instead of registering an edict which they disapproved. They would urge that the ministers had abused his Majesty's confidence. They would also take pains to have their protest printed and sold on the streets at a penny or two a copy, so that people should get the idea that the *parlement* was defending the nation against the oppressive measures of the king's ministers.

When the king received one of these protests two alternatives were open to him. He might recall the distasteful decree altogether, or modify it so as to suit the court; or he could summon the *parlement* before him and in a solemn session (called a *lit de justice*) command it with his own mouth to register the law in its records. The *parlement* would then reluctantly obey; but as the Revolution approached it began to claim that a decree registered against its will was not valid.

The *parlements* help to prepare the way for the Revolution

Struggles between the *parlements* and the king's ministers were very frequent in the eighteenth century. They prepared the way for the Revolution, first, by bringing important questions to the attention of the people; for there were no newspapers, and no parliamentary or congressional debates, to enable the

public to understand the policy of the government. Secondly, the *parlements* not only frankly criticised the proposed measures of the king and his ministers, but they familiarized the nation with the idea that the king was not really at liberty to alter what they called "the fundamental laws" of the State. By this they meant that there was an unwritten constitution, which limited the king's power and of which they were the guardians. In this way they promoted the growing discontent with a government which was carried on in secret, and which left the nation at the mercy of the men in whom the king might for the moment repose confidence.

Public opinion

It is a great mistake to suppose that public opinion did not exercise a powerful check upon the king, even under the autocratic old régime. It was, as one of Louis XVI's ministers declared, "an invisible power which, without treasury, guards, or an army, ruled Paris and the court, — yes, the very palace of the king." The latter half of the eighteenth century was a period of outspoken and acrid criticism of the whole existing social and governmental system. Reformers, among whom many of the king's ministers were counted, loudly and eloquently discussed the numerous abuses and the vicious character of the government, which gradually came to seem just as bad to the people of that day as it does to us now.

Attempts to check the discussion of public questions

Although there were no daily newspapers to discuss public questions, large numbers of pamphlets were written and circulated by individuals whenever there was an important crisis, and they answered much the same purpose as the editorials in a modern newspaper. We have already seen how French philosophers and reformers, like Voltaire, Diderot, and Montesquieu, had been encouraged by the freedom of speech which prevailed in England, and how industriously they had sown the seeds of discontent in their own country. We have seen how in popular works, in poems and stories and plays, and above all in the *Encyclopædia*, they explained the new scientific discoveries, attacked the old beliefs and misapprehensions, and

encouraged progress. Only the most ignorant could escape their influence altogether.

The censorship of the press serves to advertise the reformers

Sometimes the pamphlets and books treated the government, the clergy, or the Catholic religion with such open contempt that either the king, or the clergy, or the courts felt it necessary to prevent their circulation. The *parlement* of Paris now and then ordered some offensive writing, such as Diderot's *Philosophic Thoughts*, Voltaire's *Handy Philosophic Dictionary*, certain of Rousseau's works, pamphlets defending the Jesuits, etc., to be burned by the common hangman. The authors, if they could be discovered, were in some cases imprisoned, and the printers and publishers fined or banished, but in general the courts satisfied themselves with suppressing the books and pamphlets of which they disapproved. But the attempted suppression only advertised the attacks upon existing abuses, which followed one another in rapid succession. The efforts of the government and the clergy to check free discussion seemed an outrage to the more thoughtful among the citizens, and so rather promoted than prevented the consideration of the weaknesses of the Church and of the king's government.

Economists argue against government restrictions on trade and manufacture

The economists exposed and brought home to the people the many evils of which their new science took note. The unjust system of taxation, which tended to exempt the richer classes from their fair share of the public burdens; the wasteful and irritating methods of collecting the taxes; the interior customs lines, preventing the easy passage of goods from one part of France to another; the extravagance of the king's household; the pensions granted to undeserving persons; every evil of the bungling, iniquitous old régime was brought under the scrutiny of the new thinkers, who tested the existing system by the light of reason and the welfare of the great mass of the people.

The French government, as has already been explained, had been in the habit of regulating manufactures with the hope of maintaining a standard which would insure large and regular

sales in foreign lands and in this way bring money into France. Governmental officials watched those who handled grain, forbade them to accumulate wheat, barley, rye, or bread stuffs, or to make any sales except in the public markets, and required them to report all their transactions to the government. The economists were flatly opposed to this system of regulation. They pointed out that these government restrictions produced some very bad results. They failed to prevent famine, and, in the case of industry, they discouraged new inventions and the adoption of better methods. The economists claimed that it would be far better to leave the manufacturer to carry on his business in his own way.[1]

How Louis XVI tried to play the Benevolent Despot

Death of Louis XV and the accession of Louis XVI (1774)

33. In 1774 Louis XV died, after a disgraceful reign of which it has not seemed necessary to say much. His unsuccessful wars, which had ended with the loss of all his American possessions and the victory of his enemies in India, had brought France to the verge of bankruptcy; indeed in his last years his ministers repudiated a portion of the government's obligations. The taxes were already so oppressive as to arouse universal discontent and yet the government was running behind seventy millions of dollars a year. The king's personal conduct was scandalous, and he allowed his mistresses and courtiers to meddle in public affairs and plunder the royal treasury for themselves and their favorites. When at last he was carried off by smallpox every one hailed, with hopes of better times, the accession of his grandson and successor, Louis XVI.

Character of Louis XVI

The new king was but twenty years old, ill educated, indolent, unsociable, and very fond of hunting and of pottering about in a workshop where he spent his happiest hours. He was a well-meaning young man, with none of his grandfather's

[1] See above, pp. 180 *sqq.*

vices, who tried now and then to attend to the disagreeable business of government, and would gladly have made his people happy if that had not required more energy than he possessed. He had none of the restless interest in public affairs that we found in Frederick the Great, Catharine II, or his brother-in-law, Joseph II; he was never tempted to rise at five o'clock in the morning in order to read State papers.

Marie Antoinette

His wife was the beautiful Marie Antoinette, daughter of Maria Theresa. The marriage had been arranged in 1770 with a view of maintaining the alliance which had been concluded between France and Austria in 1756. The queen was only nineteen years old when she came to the throne, light-hearted and on pleasure bent. She disliked the formal etiquette of the court at Versailles and shocked people by her thoughtless pranks. She rather despised her heavy husband, who did not care to share in the amusements which pleased her best. She did not hesitate to interfere in the government when she wished to help one of her favorites or to make trouble for some one she disliked.

Turgot, controller general (1774–1776)

At first Louis XVI took his duties very seriously. It seemed for a time that he might find a place among the benevolent despots who were then ruling in Europe. He almost immediately placed the ablest of all the French economists, Turgot, in the most important of the government offices, that of controller general. Turgot was an experienced government official as well as a scholar. For thirteen years he had been the king's representative in Limoges, one of the least prosperous portions of France. There he had had ample opportunity to see the vices of the prevailing system of taxation. He had made every effort to induce the government to better its methods, and had tried to familiarize the people with the principles of political economy. Consequently, when he was put in charge of the nation's finances, it seemed as if he and the conscientious young king might find some remedy for the recognized abuses.

Turgot advocates economy

The first and most natural measure was economy, for only in that way could the government be saved from bankruptcy and the burden of taxation be lightened. Turgot felt that the vast amount spent in maintaining the luxury of the royal court at Versailles should be reduced. The establishments of the king, the queen, and the princes of the blood royal cost the State annually toward twelve million dollars. Then the French king had long been accustomed to grant "pensions" in a reckless manner to his favorites, and this required nearly twelve million dollars more.

How the courtiers governed France

Any attempt, however, to reduce this amount would arouse the immediate opposition of the courtiers, and it was the courtiers who really governed France. They had every opportunity to influence the king's mind against a man whose economies they disliked. They were constantly about the monarch from the moment when he awoke in the morning until he went to bed at night; therefore they had an obvious advantage over the controller general, who only saw him in business hours.[1]

Turgot frees the grain trade and endeavors to teach political economy to the people

Immediately upon coming into power Turgot removed a great part of the restrictions on the grain trade. He prefaced the edict with a very frank denunciation of the government's traditional policy of preventing persons from buying and selling their grain when and where they wished. He showed that this did not obviate famines, as the government hoped that it might, and that it caused great loss and hardship. If the government would only let matters alone the grain would always go to those provinces where it was most needed, for there it would bring the best price. Turgot seized this and every similar opportunity to impress important economic truths upon the minds of the people.

Turgot abolishes the guilds

Early in 1776 Turgot brought forward two edicts which could not fail to rouse much opposition. The first of these abolished the guilds, which he declared exercised "a vast tyranny

[1] See Turgot's letter to the king, August, 1774, in *Readings*, sect. 33.

over trade and industry." In almost all the towns the various trades of the baker, tailor, barber, swordmaker, hatter, cooper, and all the rest, were each in the hands of a small number of masters who formed a union to keep every one else out, and who made such rules as they pleased about the way in which the trade should be conducted. Sometimes only the sons of masters or those who married masters' widows would be permitted to carry on a trade. Employers could not select the workmen they wished. "Often," Turgot declared, "one cannot get the simplest job done without having it go through the hands of several workmen of different guilds and without suffering the delays, tricks, and exactions which the pretensions of the various guilds encourage." The king, therefore, ordered that "it shall be free to all persons of whatever quality or condition they may be, even to all foreigners, to exercise in all our kingdom, and particularly in our good city of Paris, whatever profession or industry may seem good to them." All the guilds were abolished, in spite of those who declared that industry would be ruined as soon as everybody was free to open a shop and offer his goods to the public.

Turgot abolishes the *corvée* and so attacks the privileges of the clergy and the nobility

At the same time Turgot proposed an even more important reform. The government had been accustomed to build and repair the public roads, forcing the peasants to bring out their horses and carts and work for a certain time every year without remuneration. This was of course a form of taxation and was known as the *corvée*. Turgot held that the peasants should not be required to bear this burden and proposed to substitute for it a tax to be paid by the landholders. Both the clergy and nobility hotly opposed this reform on the ground that their privileges exempted them from the *corvée*, which was an ignoble exaction which could fall only upon a peasant. Turgot confessed that his main aim was to begin a great reform of the vicious system of taxation which exempted the privileged classes from the *corvée*, the *taille*, and other contributions which should be borne by everybody according to his capacity.

Turgot forced the *parlement* of Paris to register these edicts; but he had become very unpopular, for each one of his reforms injured a particular class who thereafter became his enemies. The nobles disliked him for substituting the land tax, which fell upon them, for the *corvée*, which only the peasants had borne. The clergy believed him a wicked philosopher, for it was known that he had urged the pious Louis XVI, when he took his coronation oath, to omit the pledge to extirpate heresy from his realms. The tradespeople hated him for doing away with the guilds.

Turgot's enemies

An Italian economist, when he heard of Turgot's appointment, wrote to a friend in France: "So Turgot is controller general! He will not remain in office long enough to carry out his plans. He will punish some scoundrels; he will bluster about and lose his temper; he will be anxious to do good, but will run against obstacles and rogues at every turn. Public credit will fall; he will be detested; it will be said that he is not fitted for his task. Enthusiasm will cool; he will retire or be sent off, and we shall have a new proof of the mistake of filling a position like his in a monarchy like yours with an upright man and a philosopher."

Turgot's position

The Italian could not have made a more accurate statement of the case had he waited until after the dismissal of Turgot, which took place in May, 1776, much to the satisfaction of the court. The king, although upright and well-intentioned, was not fond of the governmental duties to which Turgot was always calling his attention. It was much easier to let things go along in the old way; for reforms not only required much extra work, but they also forced him to refuse the customary favors to those around him. It was not perhaps unnatural that the discontent of his young queen or of an intimate companion should outweigh the woes of the distant peasant.

Turgot dismissed, May, 1776

Although the privileged classes, especially the courtiers who had the king's ear and the conservative lawyers in the *parlements*, prevented Turgot from carrying out the extensive

Turgot's plan for local assemblies

reforms that he had in mind, and even induced the king to restore the guilds and to continue the *corvée*, Turgot's administration nevertheless forwarded the French Revolution. In the preambles to his edicts he carefully explained the nature of the abuses which the king was trying to remedy and so strove to enlist the sympathy of the public. He proposed that the king should form local assemblies to help him in the government, as otherwise too much power was left in the hands of the king's officials. In short, while Turgot was quite satisfied to have a benevolent despot in France so long as the king allowed himself to be led along the path of reform by a wise philosopher and economist, he was anxious to encourage public interest in the policy of the government, and believed it essential to have the people's representatives help in assessing the taxes and in managing local affairs.

Necker succeeds Turgot

Necker, who, after a brief interval, succeeded Turgot, also contributed to the progress of the coming Revolution in two ways. He borrowed vast sums of money in order to carry on the war which France, as the ally of the United States, had undertaken against England. This greatly embarrassed the treasury later and helped to produce the financial crisis which was the immediate cause of the Revolution. Secondly, he gave the nation its first opportunity of learning what was done with the public funds by presenting to the king (February, 1781) a *report* on the financial condition of the kingdom which was publicly printed and eagerly read. There the people could see for the first time how much the *taille* and the salt tax actually took from them, and how much the king spent on himself and his favorites.

Necker's financial report

Calonne, controller general (1783–1787)

Necker was soon followed by Calonne, who may be said to have precipitated the momentous reform which constitutes the French Revolution. He was very popular at first with king and courtiers, for he spent the public funds far more recklessly than his predecessors. But naturally he soon found himself in a position where he could obtain no more money. The

parlements would consent to no more loans in a period of peace, and the taxes were as high as it was deemed possible to make them. At last Calonne, finding himself desperately put to it, informed the astonished king that the State was on the verge of bankruptcy, and that in order to save it a radical reformation of "the whole public order" was necessary. This report of Calonne's may be taken as the beginning of the French Revolution, for it was the first of the series of events that led to the calling of a representative assembly which abolished the old régime and gave France a written constitution.

Calonne informs the king that France is on the verge of bankruptcy, August, 1786

REFERENCES

The Government of Louis XVI: LOWELL, *The Eve of the French Revolution*, pp. 4–24; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. ii, pp. 36–65; MATHEWS, *The French Revolution*, pp. 1–11.

Taxation and Finance: LOWELL, pp. 207–242; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. iii, pp. 66–78.

Agitation by Pamphlets: LOWELL, pp. 322–341.

Lettres de Cachet: PERKINS, *France under Louis XV*, Vol. II, pp. 352–358.

Turgot and Necker: MATHEWS, pp. 92–101; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. iii, pp. 66–78; HASSALL, *Balance of Power*, pp. 405–412; SAY, *Turgot* (Great French Writers Series).

Early Years of Louis XVI's Reign: HASSALL, pp. 401–424; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. iv, pp. 79–98.

CHAPTER XII

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

How the Estates General were summoned in 1789

Reforms proposed by Calonne

34. Calonne claimed that it was necessary, in order to avoid ruin, "to reform everything vicious in the State." He proposed, therefore, to reduce the *taille*, reform the salt tax, do away with the interior customs lines, correct the abuses of the guilds, etc. But the chief reform, and by far the most difficult one, was to force the privileged classes to surrender their important exemptions from taxation. He hoped that if certain concessions were made to them they might be brought to consent to a land tax which should be levied on the nobility and clergy as well as on the third estate. So he proposed to the king that he should summon an assembly of persons prominent in Church and State, called "Notables," to ratify certain changes which would increase the prosperity of the country and bring money enough into the treasury to meet the necessary expenses.

Summoning of the Notables, 1786

The summoning of the Notables late in 1786 was really a revolution in itself. It was a confession on the part of the king that he found himself in a predicament from which he could not escape without the aid of his people. The Notables whom he selected — bishops, archbishops, dukes, judges, high government officials — were practically all members of the privileged classes; but they still represented the nation, after a fashion, as distinguished from the king's immediate circle of courtiers.

In his opening address Calonne gave the Notables an idea of the sad financial condition of the country. The government

was running behind some forty million dollars a year. He could not continue to borrow, and economy, however strict, would not suffice to cover the deficit. "What, then," he asked, "remains to fill this frightful void and enable us to raise the revenue to the desired level? *The Abuses!* Yes, gentlemen, the abuses offer a source of wealth which the State should appropriate, and which should serve to reëstablish order in the finances. . . . Those abuses which must now be destroyed for the welfare of the people are the most important and the best guarded of all, the very ones which have the deepest roots and the most spreading branches. For example, those which weigh on the laboring classes, the pecuniary privileges, exceptions to the law which should be common to all, and many an unjust exemption which can only relieve certain taxpayers by embittering the conditions of others; the general want of uniformity in the assessment of the taxes and the enormous difference which exists between the contributions of different provinces and of the subjects of the same sovereign; the severity and arbitrariness in the collection of the *taille;* the apprehension, embarrassment, almost dishonor, associated with the trade in breadstuffs; the interior customhouses and barriers which make the various parts of the kingdom like foreign countries to one another . . . ," — all these evils, which public-spirited citizens had long deprecated, Calonne proposed to do away with forthwith.

Calonne denounces the abuses (February 22, 1787)

The Notables, however, had no confidence in Calonne; most of them were determined not to give up their privileges, and they refused to ratify his program of reform. The king then dismissed Calonne and soon sent the Notables home, too (May, 1787). He then attempted to carry through some of the more pressing financial reforms in the usual way by drawing up edicts and sending them to the *parlements* to be registered.

Calonne and the Notables dismissed

The *parlement* of Paris resolved, as usual, to make the king's ministry trouble and gain popularity for itself. This

The *parlement* of Paris refuses to register new taxes and calls for the Estates General

time it resorted to a truly extraordinary measure. It not only refused to register two new taxes which the king desired, but asserted that "*Only the nation assembled in the Estates General can give the consent necessary to the establishment of a permanent tax.*" "Only the nation," the *parlement* continued, "after it has learned the true state of the finances, can destroy the great abuses and open up important resources." This declaration was followed in a few days by the respectful request that the king assemble the Estates General of his kingdom.

The refusal of the *parlement* to register the new taxes led to one of the old struggles between it and the king's ministers. A compromise was arranged in the autumn of 1787; the *parlement* agreed to register a great loan, and the king pledged himself to assemble the Estates General within five years. During the early months of 1788 a flood of pamphlets appeared, criticising the system of taxation and the unjust privileges and exemptions enjoyed by a few citizens to the detriment of the great mass of the nation.

The *parlement* of Paris protests against the "reform" of the judicial system

Suddenly the *parlement* of Paris learned that the king's ministers were planning to put an end to its troublesome habit of opposing their measures. They proposed to remodel the whole judicial system and take from the *parlement* the right to register new decrees and consequently the right to protest. This the *parlement* loudly proclaimed was in reality a blow at the nation itself. The ministers were attacking it simply because it had acknowledged its lack of power to grant new taxes and had requested the king to assemble the representatives of the nation. The ministers, it claimed, were bent upon establishing an out-and-out despotism in which there should no longer be any check whatever on the arbitrary power of the king.

The *parlement* had long been wont to refer to certain "fundamental laws" which formed a sort of unwritten constitution limiting the powers of the king. It now ventured to

formulate some of these: (1) the right of the nation to grant all taxes voluntarily through their representatives in the Estates General; (2) the right of the provinces which had been annexed to France to retain all the liberties which the king had guaranteed to them when they came under his rule; and the right of the local *parlement* in each of these provinces to examine every edict of the king and refuse to register it if it did not conform to the constitutional laws of the province, or violated its rights; (3) the right of the judges to retain their offices no matter how anxious the king might be to dismiss them; (4) the right of every citizen, if arrested, to be brought immediately before a competent court and only to be tried by the regular judges.

The *parlement* of Paris draws up a Declaration of Rights (May, 1788)

This was a very poor and inadequate sketch of a constitution, but it was a definite protest against allowing the king to become an absolute and uncontrolled despot. According to the new edicts against which the *parlement* of Paris protested, tyrannical ministers might freely make new laws for the whole realm and completely ignore the special privileges which the king had pledged himself to maintain when Languedoc, Provence, Dauphiny, Brittany, Béarn, Navarre, and other important provinces had originally been added to his kingdom. The cause of the *parlements* seemed the cause of the nation, and their protest contributed to the excitement and indignation which spread throughout France and which was to continue until the whole system of government was completely reformed.

The provinces of France support the *parlements*

When the king's commissioners tried to proclaim the edicts which robbed the *parlements* of their right to register new laws, mobs collected and insulted them. At Rennes, in Brittany, they were besieged by the townspeople and had to be protected by soldiers. At Toulouse the mob tore up the pavement to build barricades and prepared to resist the entry of the commissioners. At Bordeaux the new laws were proclaimed under the protection of bayonets. Everywhere there were protests, usually accompanied by disorder.

Opposition roused in Dauphiny

The most interesting events took place at Grenoble, where the *parlement* of Dauphiny was accustomed to meet. It declared that, if the king persisted in his plan, he would break all the bonds which bound that province to France and that Dauphiny would consider itself entirely freed from the oath of fidelity to him. When the king's officers arrived to punish the *parlement* for its audacious utterances, they found the city ready to defend it. An assembly was convened at the neighboring Vizille where representatives of the nobility, clergy, and third estate came together. They denounced the policy of the king's ministers, demanded the speedy convocation of the Estates General, and reiterated the right of the nation to grant all taxes and to be protected from arbitrary punishment. They claimed that they were vindicating the rights of the nation at large, and that they were ready, if necessary, to sacrifice any of their special privileges in the interest of the whole kingdom.

Meeting at Vizille

The Estates General summoned for 1789

This demonstration on the part of Dauphiny and similar ones in the other provinces forced the king to dismiss the unpopular ministry and to recall Necker, who had followed Turgot as controller general and in whom everybody had great confidence. Necker restored the *parlements* to their old power and, as the treasury was absolutely empty, there seemed nothing to do but to call together the representatives of the people. Necker therefore announced that the Estates General would convene early the next year.[1]

General ignorance in regard to the Estates General

It was now discovered that no one knew much about this body of which every one was talking, for it had not met since 1614. The king accordingly issued a general invitation to scholars to find out all they could about the customs observed

[1] The *parlements* immediately lost all their importance. They had helped to precipitate the reform but they did not sympathize with any change which would deprive the privileged classes, to which their members belonged, of their ancient exemptions. They therefore forfeited their popularity when in September, 1788, they declared that the Estates General should meet in its old way, which would have enabled the privileged classes to stop any distasteful reforms.

in the former meetings of the Estates. The public naturally became very much interested in a matter which touched them so closely, and there were plenty of readers for the pamphlets which now began to appear in greater numbers than ever before.

The old system of voting by classes in the Estates General

The old Estates General had been organized in a way appropriate enough to the feudal conditions under which it originated. Each of the three estates of the realm — clergy, nobility, and third estate — sent an equal number of representatives, who were expected to consider not the interests of the nation but the special interests of the particular social class to which they respectively belonged. Accordingly the deputies of the three estates did not sit together or vote as a single body. The members of each group first came to an agreement among themselves and then cast a single vote for the whole order. The Estates General thus had three houses instead of two, like the English Parliament and the Congress of the United States, which had just been established.

Objections to the system

It was natural that this system should seem preposterous to the average Frenchman in 1788. If the Estates should be convoked according to the ancient forms, the two privileged classes would together be entitled to twice the number of representatives allotted to the other twenty-five million inhabitants of France. What was much worse, it seemed impossible that any important reforms could be adopted in an assembly where those who had every selfish reason for opposing the most necessary changes were given two votes out of three. Necker, whom the king had recalled in the hope that he might succeed in adjusting the finances, agreed that the third estate might have as many deputies as both the other orders put together, namely six hundred, but he would not consent to having the three orders sit and vote together, as the nation at large desired.

Of the innumerable pamphlets which now appeared, the most famous was that written by Sieyès, called *What is the*

Sieyès's pamphlet, *What is the Third Estate?* (*Qu'est-ce que le tiers état?*)

Third Estate? He claimed that the "aristocrats," or privileged classes, should be simply neglected, since the deputies of the third estate would represent practically the whole nation, namely, some twenty-five million or more individuals of whom less than two hundred thousand, as he estimated, were nobles and priests. "It is impossible," he says, "to answer the question, What place should the privileged orders be assigned in the social body, for it is like asking Where, in the human body, does the malign ulcer belong which torments and weakens the unhappy victim?"

The *cahiers*

Besides the great question as to whether the deputies should vote by head or by order, the pamphlets discussed what reforms the Estates should undertake. We have, however, a still more interesting and important expression of public opinion in France at this time, in the *cahiers*,[1] or lists of grievances and suggestions for reform, which, in pursuance of an old custom, the king asked the nation to prepare. Each village and town throughout France had an opportunity to tell quite frankly exactly what it suffered from the existing system, and what reforms it desired that the Estates General should bring about. These *cahiers*[2] were the "last will and testament" of the old régime, and they constitute a unique historical document of unparalleled completeness and authenticity. No one can read the *cahiers* without seeing that the nation was ready for the great transformation which, within a year, was to destroy a great part of the social and political system under which the French had lived for centuries.

Desire of the nation for a constitutional, instead of an absolute, monarchy

Almost all the *cahiers* agreed that the prevailing disorder and the vast and ill-defined powers of the king and his ministers were perhaps the fundamental evils. One of them says: "Since arbitrary power has been the source of all the evils which afflict the State, our first desire is the establishment of a really national constitution, which shall define the rights of all and provide the

[1] Pronounced kă-yā'.

[2] An example of the *cahiers* may be found in the *Readings*, sect. 34.

laws to maintain them." No one dreamed at this time of displacing the king or of taking the government out of his hands. The people only wished to change an absolute monarchy into a limited, or constitutional, one. All that was necessary was that the things which the government might *not* do should be solemnly and irrevocably determined and put upon record, and that the Estates General should meet periodically to grant the taxes, give the king advice in national crises, and expostulate, if necessary, against any violations of the proposed charter of liberties.

Practically universal manhood suffrage

The king expressed the wish that he might reach all his subjects, no matter how remote or humble they might be. He consequently permitted every one whose name appeared upon the list of taxpayers to vote, either directly or indirectly, for deputies. As he and his predecessors had always been careful to have every one pay taxes that had anything whatever to pay, this was practically equivalent to modern universal manhood suffrage.

Many parish priests elected

The village priests were all allowed to vote directly for deputies of their order. Since they hated the rich prelates who spent their time at the court of Versailles, they naturally elected as many as they could of their own rank. The result was that two thirds of the representatives of the clergy in the Estates General were simple parish priests who were in sympathy with the people and more commonly sided with the third estate than with the bishops and abbots, who were bent upon defending the old privileges and blocking reform.

The Estates General meets, May 5, 1789

With these ideas expressed in the *cahiers* in mind, the Estates assembled in Versailles and held their first session on May 5, 1789. The king had ordered the deputies to wear the same costumes that had been worn at the last meeting of the Estates in 1614; but no royal edict could call back the spirit of earlier centuries. The representatives of the third estate refused to organize themselves in the old way as a separate order. They sent invitation after invitation to the deputies of

the clergy and nobility, requesting them to join the people's representatives and deliberate in common on the great interests of the nation. Some of the more liberal of the nobles — Lafayette, for example — and a large minority of the clergy wished to meet with the deputies of the third estate.[1] But they were outvoted, and finally the deputies of the third estate (under the influence of Sieyès), losing patience, declared themselves on June 17 a "National Assembly." They argued that, since they represented at least ninety-six per cent of the nation, the deputies of the privileged orders might be neglected altogether. This usurpation of power on the part of the third estate transformed the old feudal Estates, voting by orders, into the first modern national representative assembly on the continent of Europe.

The representatives of the third estate declare themselves a "National Assembly"

Under the influence of his courtiers the king tried to restore the old system by arranging a solemn joint session of the three orders, at which he presided in person. He presented a long program of excellent reforms, and then bade the Estates sit apart, according to the former custom. But it was like bidding water to run up hill. Three days before, when the commons had found themselves excluded from their regular place of meeting on account of the preparations for the royal session, they had betaken themselves to a neighboring building called the "Tennis Court." Here, on June 20, they took the famous "Tennis-Court" oath, never to separate "until the constitution of the kingdom should be established and placed upon a firm foundation." They were emboldened in their purpose to resist all schemes to frustrate a general reform by the support of over half of the deputies of the clergy, who joined them the day before the royal session.

The "Tennis-Court" oath

Consequently, when the king finished his address and commanded the three orders to disperse immediately in order to

[1] The nobles, of whom a few sympathized with the third estate, rejected the proposed union by a vote of 188 to 47. The vote of the clergy, made up largely of parish priests, stood 133 to 114, so ten more noes, in their case, would have turned the scale.

resume their separate sessions, most of the bishops, some of the parish priests, and a great part of the nobility obeyed; the rest sat still, uncertain what they should do. When the master of ceremonies ordered them to comply with the king's commands, Count Mirabeau, who was to prove himself the most distinguished statesman among the deputies, told him bluntly that they would not leave their places except at the point of the bayonet. The weak king almost immediately gave in, and a few days later ordered all the deputies of the privileged orders, who had not already done so, to join the commons.

The nobility and clergy forced to join the third estate

This was a momentous victory for the nation. The representatives of the privileged classes had been forced to unite with the third estate, to deliberate with them, and to vote "by head." Moreover the National Assembly had pledged itself never to separate until it had regenerated the kingdom and given France a constitution. It was no longer simply to vote taxes and help the king's treasury out of its perennial difficulties.

First momentous victory of the nation

First Reforms of the National Assembly, July–October, 1789

35. The National Assembly now began in earnest the great task of preparing a constitution for France. It was, however, soon interrupted. The little group of noblemen and prelates who spent much of their time in the king's palace formed what was known as the court party. They were not numerous but could influence the king as no other group in the nation could do. They naturally opposed reform; they neither wished to give up their own privileges nor to have the king come under the control of the National Assembly, for that would mean that he would no longer be able to give them the pensions and lucrative positions which they now readily obtained. This court "ring" enjoyed the hearty support of the queen, Marie Antoinette, and of the king's younger brother, the count of Artois, both of whom regarded the deputies of the third estate as

The court party determines to disperse the National Assembly

insolent and dangerous agitators who proposed to rob the monarch of the powers which had been conferred upon him by God himself. The queen and her friends had got rid of Turgot and Calonne, who had endeavored to change the old order; why should they not disperse the Estates General, which was escaping from the control of the clergy and nobility?

Troops sent to Paris; Necker's dismissal, July, 1789

The king agreed to the court party's plans. He summoned the Swiss and German troops in the employ of France and sent a company of them into Paris in order that they might suppress any violence on the part of the townspeople, should he decide to send the arrogant deputies home. He was also induced to dismiss Necker, who enjoyed a popularity that he had, in reality, done little to merit. When the people of Paris saw the troops gathering and heard of the dismissal of Necker they became excited. Camille Desmoulins, a brilliant young journalist, rushed into the garden of the Palais Royal, where crowds of people were discussing the situation, and, leaping upon a table, announced that the Swiss and German soldiers would soon be slaughtering all the "patriots." He urged the people to arm and defend both themselves and the National Assembly from the attacks of the court party, which wished to betray the nation. All night the mob surged about the streets, seeking arms in the shops of the gunsmiths and breaking into bakeries and taverns to satisfy their hunger and thirst.

Camille Desmoulins excites the Parisians, July 12, 1789

Attack on the Bastille, July 14, 1789

This was but the prelude to the great day of July 14, when crowds of people assembled to renew the search for arms, and to perform, mayhap, some deed of patriotism. One of the lawless bands made its way to the ancient fortress of the Bastille, which stood in the poorer quarter of the city. Here the mob expected to find arms, but the governor of the fortress, de Launay, naturally refused to supply the crowd with weapons. He had, moreover, mounted cannons on the parapets, which made the inhabitants of the region very nervous. The people hated the castle, which they imagined to be full of dark dungeons and instruments of torture. It appeared to them a symbol

of tyranny, for it had long been used as a place of confinement for those whom the king imprisoned by his arbitrary orders, the *lettres de cachet*. While there seemed no hope of taking the fortress, whose walls, ten feet thick, towered high above them, the attempt was made. Negotiations with the governor were opened and, during these, a part of the crowd pressed across a drawbridge into the court. Here, for some reason that has never been explained, the troops in the castle fired upon the people and killed nearly a hundred of them. Meanwhile the mob on the outside continued an ineffectual but desperate attack until de Launay was forced by the garrison to surrender on condition that they should be allowed to retire unmolested. The drawbridge was then let down and the crowd rushed into the gloomy pile. They found only seven prisoners, whom they freed with great enthusiasm. But the better element in the crowd was unable to restrain the violent and cruel class, represented in every mob, who proposed to avenge the slaughter of their companions in the courtyard of the Bastille. Consequently the Swiss soldiers, who formed the garrison, were killed, and their heads, with that of de Launay, were paraded about the streets on pikes.

Significance of the fall of the Bastille

The fall of the Bastille is one of the most impressive, striking, and dramatic events in modern history, and its anniversary is still celebrated in France as the chief national holiday. On that day the people of Paris rose to protect themselves against the plots of the courtiers, who wished to maintain the old despotic system. They attacked an ancient monument of despotism, forced the king's officer in charge of it to capitulate, and then destroyed the walls of the fortress so that nothing now remains except a line of white stones to mark its former site. The events of the 14th of July, 1789, have been "disfigured and transfigured by legends," but none the less they opened a new era of freedom inasmuch as they put an end to the danger of a return to the *Ancien Régime*. It is true that the court party continued to make trouble, but its

Beginning of the emigration of the nobles

opposition served to hasten rather than to impede reform. Some of the leaders of the group, among them the king's younger brother, the count of Artois (who was destined to become king as Charles X), left France immediately after the fall of the Bastille and began actively urging foreign monarchs to intervene to protect Louis XVI from the reformers.

The national guard

It had become clear that the king could not maintain order in Paris. The shopkeepers and other respectable citizens were compelled to protect themselves against the wild crowds made up of the criminal and disorderly class of the capital and reënforced by half-starving men who had drifted to Paris on account of the famine which prevailed in the provinces. In order to prevent attacks on individuals and the sacking of shops, a "national guard" was organized, made up of volunteers from the well-to-do citizens. General Lafayette, one of the most liberal-minded of the nobles, was put in command. This deprived the king of every excuse for calling in his regular troops to insure order in Paris, and put the military power into the hands of the *bourgeoisie*, as the French call the class made up of the more prosperous business men.

Establishment of *communes* in Paris and other cities

The government of Paris was reorganized, and a mayor, chosen from among the members of the National Assembly, was put at the head of the new *commune*, as the municipal government was called. The other cities of France also began with one accord, after the dismissal of Necker and the fall of the Bastille, to promote the Revolution by displacing or supplementing their former governments by committees of their citizens. These improvised communes, or city governments, established national guards, as Paris had done, and thus maintained order. The news that the king had approved the changes at Paris confirmed the citizens of other cities in the conviction that they had done right in taking the control into their own hands. We shall hear a good deal of the commune, or municipal government, of Paris later, as it played a very important rôle in the Reign of Terror.

Disorder in the country districts

By the end of the month of July the commotion reached the country districts. A curious panic swept over the land, which the peasants long remembered as "the great fear." A mysterious rumor arose that the "brigands" were coming! The terrified people did what they could to prepare for the danger, although they had no clear idea of what it was; neighboring communities combined with one another for mutual protection. When the panic was over and people saw that there were no brigands after all, they turned their attention to an enemy by no means imaginary, i.e. the old régime. The peasants assembled on the village common, or in the parish church, and voted to pay the feudal dues no longer. The next step was to burn the *châteaux*, or castles of the nobles, in order to destroy the records of the peasants' obligations to their feudal lords.

Night of August 4–5

About the 1st of August news reached the National Assembly of the burning of *châteaux* in various parts of the kingdom, and of the obstinate refusal of the country people to pay the tithes, taxes, rents, and feudal dues. It seemed absolutely necessary to pacify and encourage the people by announcing sweeping reforms. Consequently during the celebrated night session of August 4–5, amid great excitement, the members of the privileged orders, led by the viscount of Noailles, a relative of Lafayette who had fought with him in America, vied with one another in surrendering their ancient privileges.[1]

The exclusive right of the nobility to hunt and to maintain their huge pigeon houses was abolished, and the peasant was

[1] Of course the nobles and clergy had very little prospect of retaining their privileges even if they did not give them up voluntarily. This was bitterly emphasized by Marat in his newspaper, *The Friend of the People*. "Let us not be duped! If these sacrifices of privileges were due to benevolence, it must be confessed that the voice of benevolence has been raised rather late in the day. When the lurid flames of their burning *châteaux* have illuminated France, these people have been good enough to give up the privilege of keeping in fetters men who had already gained their liberty by force of arms. When they see the punishment that awaits robbers, extortioners, and tyrants like themselves they generously abandon the feudal dues and agree to stop bleeding the wretched people who can barely keep body and soul together."

Decree abolishing the feudal dues, hunting rights, and other privileges

permitted to kill game which he found on his land. The tithes of the Church were done away with. Exemptions from the payment of taxes were abolished forever. It was decreed that "taxes shall be collected from all citizens and from all property in the same manner and in the same form," and that "all citizens, without distinction of birth, are eligible to any office or dignity." Moreover, inasmuch as a national constitution would be of more advantage to the provinces than the privileges which some of these enjoyed, and — so the decree continues — "inasmuch as the surrender of such privileges is essential to the intimate union of all parts of the realm, it is decreed that all the peculiar privileges, pecuniary or otherwise, of the provinces, principalities, districts, cantons, cities, and communes, are once for all abolished and are absorbed into the law common to all Frenchmen." [1]

Unification of France through the abolition of the ancient provinces and the creation of the present departments

This decree thus proclaimed the equality and uniformity for which the French people had so long sighed. The injustice of the former system of taxation could never be reintroduced. All France was to have the same laws, and its citizens were henceforth to be treated in the same way by the State, whether they lived in Brittany or Dauphiny, in the Pyrenees or on the Rhine. A few months later the Assembly went a step farther in consolidating and unifying France. It wiped out the old provinces altogether by dividing the whole country into districts of convenient size, called *départements*. These were much more numerous than the ancient divisions, and were named after rivers and mountains. This obliterated from the map all reminiscences of the feudal disunion.

The Declaration of the Rights of Man

Many of the *cahiers* had suggested that the Estates should draw up a clear statement of the rights of the individual citizen. It was urged that the recurrence of abuses and the insidious encroachments of despotism might in this way be forever prevented. The National Assembly consequently determined

[1] This edict is given in the *Readings*, sect. 35. The nobles were to be indemnified for some of the important but less offensive of the feudal dues.

to prepare such a declaration in order to gratify and reassure the people and to form a basis for the new constitution.

This Declaration of the Rights of Man (completed August 26) is one of the most notable documents in the history of Europe. It not only aroused general enthusiasm when it was first published, but it appeared over and over again, in a modified form, in the succeeding French constitutions down to 1848, and has been the model for similar declarations in many of the other continental states. It was a dignified repudiation of the abuses described in the preceding chapter. Behind each article there was some crying evil of long standing against which the people wished to be forever protected, — *lettres de cachet*, religious persecution, censorship of the press, and despotism in general.

Contents of the Declaration

The Declaration sets forth that "Men are born and remain equal in rights. Social distinctions can only be founded upon the general good." "Law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate, personally or through his representative, in its formation. It must be the same for all." "No person shall be accused, arrested, or imprisoned except in the cases and according to the forms prescribed by law." "No one shall be disquieted on account of his opinions, including his religious views, provided that their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by law." "The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious of the rights of man. Every citizen may, accordingly, speak, write, and print with freedom, being responsible, however, for such abuses of this freedom as shall be defined by law." "All citizens have a right to decide, either personally or by their representative, as to the necessity of the contribution to the public treasury, to grant this freely, to know to what uses it is put, and to fix the proportion, the mode of assessment and of collection, and the duration of the taxes." "Society has the right to require of every public agent an account of his administration." Well might the Assembly claim,

in its address to the people, that "the rights of man had been misconceived and insulted for centuries," and boast that they were "reëstablished for all humanity in this declaration, which shall serve as an everlasting war cry against oppressors."

The National Assembly in Paris, October, 1789 to September, 1791

The court party once more plans a counter-revolution

36. The king hesitated to ratify the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and about the first of October rumors became current that, under the influence of the courtiers, he was calling together troops and preparing for another attempt to put an end to the Revolution, similar to that which the attack on the Bastille had frustrated. A regiment arrived from Flanders and was entertained at a banquet given by the king's guard at Versailles. The queen was present, and it was reported in Paris that the officers, in their enthusiasm for her, had trampled under foot the new national colors, — the red, white, and blue, — which had been adopted after the fall of the Bastille. These things, along with the scarcity of food due to the poor crops of the year, aroused the excitable Paris populace to fever heat.

A Paris mob invades the king's palace and carries him off to Paris

On October 5 several thousand women and a number of armed men marched out to Versailles to ask bread of the king, in whom they had great confidence personally, however suspicious they might be of his friends and advisers. Lafayette marched after the crowd with the national guard, but did not prevent some of the people from invading the king's palace the next morning and nearly murdering the queen, who had become very unpopular. She was believed to be still an Austrian at heart and to be in league with the counter-revolutionary party.

The people declared that the king must accompany them to Paris, and he was obliged to consent. Far from being disloyal, they assumed that the presence of the royal family would insure plenty and prosperity. So they gayly escorted the "baker and the baker's wife and the baker's boy," as they jocularly termed

the king and queen and the little dauphin, to the Palace of the Tuileries, where the king took up his residence, practically a prisoner, as it proved. The National Assembly soon followed him and resumed its sittings in a riding school near the Tuileries.

Disastrous results of transferring the king and the Assembly to Paris

This transfer of the king and the Assembly to the capital was the first great misfortune of the Revolution. The work of reform was by no means completed, and now the disorderly element of Paris could at any time invade the galleries and interrupt those deputies who proposed measures that did not meet with their approval. Marat's newspaper, *The Friend of the People*, assured the poor of the city that they were the real "patriots." Before long they came to hate the well-to-do middle class (the *bourgeoisie*) almost as heartily as they hated the nobles, and were ready to follow any leader who talked to them about "liberty" and vaguely denounced "traitors." Under these circumstances the populace might at any time get control of Paris, and Paris of the National Assembly. And so it fell out, as we shall see.

Mirabeau advises the king to leave Paris and call the Assembly to him

No one was more impressed by the danger than Mirabeau, whose keen insight cannot fail to fill every student of the French Revolution with admiration. After the transfer of the royal family to Paris, Mirabeau became a sort of official adviser to the king, who, however, never acted upon the advice, for both he and the queen abhorred the great orator and statesman on account of his views and his immorality. So it did no good when Mirabeau pointed out to Louis that both he and the Assembly were really prisoners in Paris, which was constantly subject to the most serious disturbances. "Its inhabitants when excited are irresistible. Winter is approaching and food may be wanting. Bankruptcy may be declared. What will Paris be three months hence? — assuredly a poorhouse, perhaps a theater of horrors. Is it to such a place that the head of the nation should intrust his existence and our only hope?" The king, he urged, should openly retire to Rouen

and summon the Assembly to him there, where reforms could be completed without interruption or coercion. Above all things, the king must not go eastward, else he would be suspected of joining the runaway nobles who were hanging about the boundaries. Yet, as we shall see, when the king finally decided to escape from Paris eighteen months later this was precisely what he did.

The new constitution

But for some time there was no considerable disorder. The deputies worked away on the constitution, and on February 4, 1790, the king visited the National Assembly and solemnly pledged himself and the queen to accept the new form of government. This provided that the sovereign should rule both by the grace of God and by the constitutional law of the State, but the nation was to be superior to the law and the law to the king. The king was to be the chief executive and to be permitted to veto bills passed by the Assembly, unless they were passed by three successive Assemblies, in which case they would become law without his ratification. This was called the suspensive veto and was supposed to be modeled upon that granted to the President of the United States.

The Legislative Assembly established by the new constitution

The constitution naturally provided that the laws should be made and the taxes granted by a representative body that should meet regularly. This was to consist, like the National Assembly, of one house, instead of two like the English Parliament. Many had favored the system of two houses, but the nobility and clergy, who would have composed the upper house on the English analogy, were still viewed with suspicion as likely to wish to restore the privileges of which they had just been deprived. Only those citizens who paid a tax equal to three days' labor were permitted to vote for deputies to the Legislative Assembly. The poorer people had, consequently, no voice in the government in spite of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, which assured equal rights to all. This and other restrictions tended to keep the power in the hands of the middle class.

The Assembly reforms the Church

Of the other reforms of the National Assembly, the most important related to the Church, which, as has been explained, continued up to the time of the Revolution to be very rich and powerful, and to retain many of its mediæval prerogatives and privileges. Its higher officials, the bishops and abbots, received very large revenues and often one prelate held a number of rich benefices, the duties of which he utterly neglected while he amused himself at Versailles. The parish priests, on the other hand, who really performed the manifold and important functions of the Church, were scarcely able to live on their incomes. This unjust apportionment of the vast revenue of the Church naturally suggested the idea that, if the State confiscated the ecclesiastical possessions, it could see that those who did the work were properly paid for it, and might, at the same time, secure a handsome sum which would help the government out of its financial troubles. Those who sympathized with Voltaire's views were naturally delighted to see their old enemy deprived of its independence and made subservient to the State, and even many good Catholics hoped that the new system would be an improvement upon the old.

Unjust division of the revenue of the Church

The National Assembly declares the property of the Church to be at the disposal of the nation

The tithes had been abolished in August along with the feudal dues. This deprived the Church of perhaps thirty million dollars a year. On November 2, 1789, a decree was passed providing that "All the ecclesiastical possessions are at the disposal of the nation on condition that it provides properly for the expenses of maintaining religious services, for the support of those who conduct them, and for the succor of the poor." This decree deprived the bishops and priests of their benefices and made them dependent on salaries paid by the State. The monasteries and convents were also, when called upon, to give up their property to meet the needs of the State.[1]

[1] The mediæval monastic orders, feeble and often degenerate, still continued to exist in France at the opening of the Revolution, — Benedictines, Carthusians, Cistercians, Franciscans, Dominicans. The State still recognized the solemn vows of poverty taken by the monks and viewed them as incapable of holding any property or receiving any bequests. It also regarded it as its duty to arrest

The *assignats*, or paper currency

The National Assembly a little later ordered inventories to be made of the lands and buildings and various sources of revenue which the bishops, priests, and monks had so long enjoyed, and then the Church property was offered for sale. Meanwhile, in order to supply an empty treasury, the Assembly determined to issue a paper currency for which the newly acquired lands would serve as security. Of these *assignats*, as this paper money was called, we hear a great deal during the revolutionary period. They soon began to depreciate, and ultimately a great part of the forty billions of francs issued during the next seven years was repudiated.

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy, completed July, 1790

After depriving the Church of its property, the Assembly deemed it necessary to completely reorganize it, and drew up the so-called Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The one hundred and thirty-four ancient bishoprics, some of which dated back to the Roman Empire, were reduced to eighty-three, so as to correspond with the new "departments" into which France had just been divided. Each of these became the diocese of a bishop, who was no longer to be appointed by the king and confirmed by the Pope[1] but was looked upon as a government

a runaway monk and restore him to his monastery. The National Assembly, shortly after declaring the property of the monasteries at the disposal of the nation, refused (February 13, 1790) longer legally to recognize perpetual monastic vows, and abolished all the orders which required them. The monks and nuns were to be free to leave their monasteries and were, in that case, to receive a pension from the government of from seven hundred to twelve hundred francs. Those, however, who preferred to remain were to be grouped in such houses as the government assigned them. In a year or so a good many of the monks appear to have deserted their old life, but very few of the nuns. Those who remained were naturally the most conservative of all; they opposed the Revolution and sided with the nonjuring clergy. This made them very unpopular with the Legislative Assembly, which in August, 1792, ordered all the monasteries to be vacated and turned over to the government for its use. At the same time it abolished all the other religious communities and associations, like the Oratorians and the Sisters of Charity, which, without requiring any solemn vows, had devoted themselves to teaching or charitable works. Many of these religious *congregations*, as the French call them, were revived in the nineteenth century and have been the cause of a good deal of agitation. See below, sect. 77.

[1] See above, p. 141. The decrees abolishing the feudal system (August 11, 1789) had already prohibited all remittances to the Pope in the shape of *annates* or other payments. The bishoprics were grouped into ten districts, each presided over by a "metropolitan" who corresponded to the former archbishop.

official, to be elected, like other government officials, by the people, and paid a regular salary. The priests, too, were to be chosen by the people instead, as formerly, by the bishop or lord of the manor; and their salaries were to be substantially increased. In Paris they were to have six thousand francs, in smaller places less, but never an amount below twelve hundred francs; even in the smallest villages they received over twice the minimum paid under the old régime. Lastly, it was provided that clergymen, upon accepting office, must all take an oath, like other government officials, to be faithful to the nation, the law, and the king, and to "maintain with all their might the constitution decreed by the Assembly."[1]

Opposition aroused by the Civil Constitution

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy proved a serious mistake. While the half-feudalized Church had sadly needed reform, the worst abuses might have been remedied without overturning the whole system, which was hallowed in the minds of most of the French people by age and religious veneration. The arbitrary suppression of fifty-one bishoprics, the election of the bishops by the ordinary voters, who included Protestants, Jews, and unbelievers, the neglect of the Pope's rights, — all shocked and alienated thousands of those who had hitherto enthusiastically applauded the reforms which the Assembly had effected. The king gave his assent to the Civil Constitution, but with the fearful apprehension that he might be losing his soul by so doing. From that time on he became an enemy of the Revolution on religious grounds.

Oath to the Constitution required of the clergy

The bishops, with very few exceptions, opposed the changes and did all they could to prevent the reforms from being carried out. Accordingly (November 27, 1790) the irritated Assembly ordered all the bishops and priests to take the oath to the Constitution (which, of course, included the new laws in regard to the Church) within a week. Those who refused were to be regarded as having resigned; and if any of them

[1] For the text of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, see the *Readings*, sect. 36.

still continued to perform their functions they were to be treated as "disturbers of the peace."

The "nonjuring" clergy become the enemies of the Revolution

Only four of the bishops consented to take the required oath and but a third of the lower clergy, although they were much better off under the new system. Forty-six thousand parish priests refused to sacrifice their religious scruples. Before long the Pope condemned the Civil Constitution and forbade the clergy to take the oath. As time went on the "nonjuring" clergy were dealt with more and more harshly by the government, and the way was prepared for the horrors of the Reign of Terror. The Revolution ceased to stand for liberty, order, and the abolition of ancient abuses, and came to mean — in the minds of many besides those who had lost their former privileges — irreligion, violence, and a new kind of oppression more cruel than the old.

Celebration of the fall of the Bastille

A year after the fall of the Bastille a great festival was held in Paris to celebrate the glorious anniversary which has been commemorated on the 14th of July ever since. Delegates were sent to Paris from all parts of France to express the sympathy of the country at large. This occasion made a deep impression upon all, as well it might. It was more than a year later, however, before the National Assembly at last finished its work and dissolved, to give place to the Legislative Assembly for which the constitution provided.

The extraordinary achievements of the National Assembly

It was little more than two years that the National Assembly had been engaged upon its tremendous task of modernizing France. No body of men has ever accomplished so much in so short a period. The English Parliament, during an existence of five hundred years, had done far less to reform England; and no monarch, with the possible exception of the unhappy Joseph II, has ever even attempted to make such deep and far-reaching changes as were permanently accomplished by the first French Assembly.

Despite the marvelous success of the Assembly, as measured by the multiplicity and the decisiveness of its reforms, it had

made many and dangerous enemies. The king and queen and the courtiers were in correspondence with the king of Prussia and the Emperor, with a hope of inducing them to intervene to check the Revolution. The runaway nobles were ready to call in foreign forces to restore the old system, and many of the clergy now regarded the Revolution as hostile to religion. Moreover the populace in Paris and in other large towns had been aroused against the Assembly by their radical leaders, their newspapers, and the political clubs. They felt that the deputies had worked only for the prosperous classes and had done little for the poor people, who should have been supplied with bread and allowed to vote. They were irritated also by the national guard commanded by that ex-noble, the marquis of Lafayette, who looked altogether too fine on his white horse. The members of the guard, too, were well dressed and only too ready to fire on the "patriots" if they dared to make a demonstration. Altogether it is easy to see that there was trouble ahead. The Revolution had gone much too far for some and not far enough for others.

The hostility aroused by the policy of the Assembly

REFERENCES

The Cahiers: LOWELL, *Eve of the French Revolution*, chaps. xxi–xxii, pp. 342–376; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, pp. 134–144.

The Pamphlets: LOWELL, chap. xx, pp. 322–341.

Convocation of the Estates General: MATHEWS, *The French Revolution*, chap. viii, pp. 102–110; STEPHENS, *History of the French Revolution*, Vol. I, Prologue, and chap. i, pp. 1–54; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, pp. 96–118.

Opening of the National Assembly: MATHEWS, chap. ix, pp. 111–124; STEPHENS, Vol. I, chap. ii, pp. 55–74; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, pp. 145–158.

Fall of the Bastille: MATHEWS, chap. x, pp. 125–137; STEPHENS, Vol. I, pp. 128–145; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, pp. 159–169.

The Country at Large in the Summer of 1789: STEPHENS, Vol. I, chap. vi, pp. 169–197.

Abolition of the Old Régime: MATHEWS, chaps. xi–xii, pp. 138–165.

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy: STEPHENS, Vol. I, chap. x, pp. 291–309.

English Attitude toward the Revolution: LECKY, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. VI, chap. xix, pp. 365–487; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. xxv, pp. 754–771.

CHAPTER XIII

THE FIRST FRENCH REPUBLIC

The Abolition of the Monarchy, 1791–1792

37. We have now studied the progress and nature of the revolution which destroyed the old régime and created modern France. Through it the unjust privileges, the perplexing irregularities, and the local differences were abolished, and the people admitted to a share in the government. This vast reform had been accomplished without serious disturbance and, with the exception of some of the changes in the Church, it had been welcomed with enthusiasm by the French nation.

The second revolution

This permanent, peaceful revolution, or reformation, was followed by a second, violent revolution, which for a time destroyed the French monarchy. It also introduced a series of further changes, many of which were fantastic and unnecessary and could not endure, since they were approved by only a few fanatical leaders. France, moreover, became involved in a war with most of the powers of western Europe. The weakness of her government, which permitted the forces of disorder and fanaticism to prevail, combined with the imminent danger of an invasion by the united powers of Europe, produced the Reign of Terror. After a period of national excitement and partial anarchy, France gladly accepted the rule of one of her military commanders, who was to prove himself far more despotic than her former kings had been. This general, Napoleon Bonaparte, did not, however, undo the great work of 1789; his colossal ambition was, on the contrary, the means of extending, directly or indirectly, many of the benefits of the Revolution to other parts of western Europe. When, after Napoleon's fall, the elder

brother of Louis XVI came to the throne, the first thing that he did was solemnly to assure the people that all the great gains of the first revolution should be maintained.

The emigration of the nobles

While practically the whole of the nation heartily rejoiced in the earlier reforms introduced by the National Assembly, and celebrated the general satisfaction and harmony by that great national festival held in Paris on the first anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, of which mention has been made,[1] some of the higher nobility refused to remain in France. The count of Artois (the king's younger brother), Calonne, the prince of Condé, and others, set the example by leaving the country just after the events of July 14, 1789. They were followed by others who were terrified or disgusted by the burning of the *châteaux*, the loss of their privileges, and the injudicious abolition of hereditary nobility by the National Assembly in June, 1790. Before long these emigrant nobles (*émigrés*), among whom were many military officers like Condé, organized a little army across the Rhine, and the count of Artois began to plan an invasion of France. He was ready to ally himself with Austria, Prussia, or any other foreign government which he could induce to help undo the Revolution and give back to the French king his former absolute power, and to the nobles their old privileges.

The conduct of the emigrant nobles discredits the king and queen

The threats and insolence of the emigrant nobles and their shameful negotiations with foreign powers discredited the members of their class who still remained in France. The people suspected that the plans of the runaways met with the secret approval of the king, and more especially of the queen, whose brother, Leopold II, was now Emperor, and ruler of the Austrian dominions. This, added to the opposition of the nonjuring clergy, produced a bitter hostility between the so-called "patriots" and those who, on the other hand, were supposed to be secretly hoping for a counter-revolution which would reëstablish the old régime.

[1] See above, p. 246.

FRANCE
during the Revolution
SCALE OF MILES
ENGLAND
ENGLISH CHANNEL
ATLANTIC OCEAN
BAY OF BISCAY
SPAIN
AUSTRIAN NETHERLANDS
HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE
SWITZERLAND
ITALY
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
CORSICA
Gulf of Genoa
Gulf of Lions
Lake of Constance
Lake Geneva
Lake Maggiore
PARIS
Havre
Bordeaux
Marseilles
Genoa
Milan
Turin
Strasbourg
Luxembourg
Brussels
Amsterdam
Calais
Dover
Southampton
Bilbao
Santander
Pamplona
Perpignan
Nice
Chambery
Lyons
Dijon
Metz
Nancy
Rouen
Caen
Nantes
Rennes
Brest
Cherbourg
Le Havre
Orleans
Tours
Limoges
Clermont
Toulouse
Montpellier
Avignon
Grenoble
Valence
Besançon
Mulhouse
Basle
Zurich
Geneva
Lausanne
Berne
Milan
Turin
Genoa
Nice
Marseilles
Montpellier
Perpignan
Barcelona
Bilbao
Santander
Pamplona
Bordeaux
Toulouse
Limoges
Clermont
Orleans
Tours
Nantes
Rennes
Brest
Cherbourg
Caen
Rouen
Le Havre
Paris
Dijon
Besançon
Mulhouse
Basle
Zurich
Geneva
Lausanne
Berne
Lyons
Grenoble
Valence
Avignon
Metz
Nancy
Strasbourg
Luxembourg
Brussels
Amsterdam
Calais
Dover
Southampton
Côtes du Nord
Ille et Vilaine
Morbihan
Loire Inférieure
Maine et Loire
Sarthe
Mayenne
Vendée
Deux Sèvres
Vienne
Charente
Charente Inférieure
Gironde
Dordogne
Lot
Lot et Garonne
Landes
Basses Pyrénées
Hautes Pyrénées
Ariège
Aude
Hérault
Gard
Bouches du Rhône
Var
Basses Alpes
Hautes Alpes
Drôme
Isère
Ardèche
Lozère
Aveyron
Tarn
Haute Garonne
Gers
Cantal
Puy de Dôme
Haute Loire
Allier
Nièvre
Cher
Indre
Indre et Loire
Loir et Cher
Loiret
Eure et Loire
Eure
Seine Inférieure
Calvados
Orne
Manche
Somme
Aisne
Ardennes
Marne
Haute Marne
Aube
Seine et Marne
Seine et Oise
Meuse
Moselle
Meurthe
Vosges
Haut Rhin
Bas Rhin
Côte d'Or
Haute Saône
Doubs
Jura
Ain
Rhône
Loire
Saône et Loire
Channel Islands
Jersey
Guernsey
Alderney
Sark
Ushant
Belle Isle
Isle of Rhé
Isle of Oleron
Isle of Aix
Isle of Dieu
Isle of Noirmoutier
Isle of Yeu
Isle of Ré

Had the king been willing to follow the advice of Mirabeau, the tragedy of the approaching Reign of Terror might probably have been avoided. France needed a strong king who would adjust himself to the new constitution, guide the Assembly, maintain order in Paris and the other great cities, and, above all, avoid any suspicion of wishing for a restoration of the old régime. Mirabeau saw clearly that the welfare of France at this juncture depended upon strengthening the monarchy. His efforts to forward this end were, however, unavailing. The fact that he accepted money from the king for advice roused the natural suspicions of the radical members of the Assembly and he was denounced as a traitor. On the other hand, he never really enjoyed the confidence of Louis XVI, who, like the queen, heartily detested him. He died April 2, 1791, at the age of forty-three, worn out by a life of dissipation, and the king was thus left with no one to hold him back from destruction.

Mirabeau fails to strengthen the monarchy, and dies, April, 1791

The worst fears of the people seemed to be justified by the secret flight of the royal family from Paris, in June, 1791. Ever since the king had reluctantly signed the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, flight had seemed to him his only resource. A body of regular troops was collected on the northeastern boundary ready to receive and protect him. If he could escape and join them at Montmédy, which was just on the frontier, about a hundred and seventy miles from Paris, he hoped that, aided by a demonstration on the part of the queen's brother, Leopold, he might march back and check the further progress of the revolutionary movement. He had, it is true, no liking for the emigrants and disapproved of their policy, nor did he believe that the old régime could ever be restored. But, unfortunately, his plans led him to attempt to reach the boundary just at the point where the emigrants were collected, viz. at Coblenz and Worms. He and the queen were, however, arrested at Varennes, when within twenty-five miles of their destination, and speedily brought back to Paris.

The flight to Varennes (June 21, 1791)

Effect of the king's flight

The desertion of the king appears to have terrified rather than angered the nation. The consternation of the people at the thought of losing, and their relief at regaining, a poor weak ruler like Louis XVI clearly shows that France was still profoundly royalist in its sympathies. The National Assembly pretended that the king had not fled but had been carried off. This gratified France at large; in Paris, however, there were some who advocated the deposition of the king, on the ground that he was clearly a traitor. Indeed, for the first time a *republican* party, small as yet, made its appearance, which urged the complete abolition of the monarchical form of government and the substitution of a democracy.

The leaders of the new republican party

Of those who had lost confidence in the king and in the monarchy, the most prominent was Dr. Marat, a physician and scholar, who before the Revolution had published several scientific works, but was now conducting the very violent newspaper already quoted, *The Friend of the People*. In this he denounced in the most extravagant language both the "aristocrats" and the "bourgeoisie," — for by "the people" he meant the great mass of workingmen in the towns and the peasants in the fields. Then there was the gentle and witty Camille Desmoulins, who had made the famous address in the Palais Royal on the 12th of July, 1789, which roused the populace to defend themselves against the plots of the courtiers. He too edited a newspaper and was a leader in the radical club called the *Cordeliers*.[1] Lastly Desmoulins's good friend Danton, with his coarse, strong face, his big voice, and his fiery eloquence, was becoming a sort of Mirabeau of the masses. He had much good sense and was not so virulent in his language as Marat, but his superabundant vitality led him to condone violence and cruelty in carrying on the Revolution and destroying its enemies.

[1] So named after the monastery where the club held its meetings. The monks had belonged to the order of St. Francis and were called *Cordeliers* on account of the heavy "cord," a rope with three knots, which they wore instead of a girdle.



DANTON

Massacre of the Champ de Mars (July 17, 1791)

Under the influence of these men a petition was drawn up demanding that the Assembly should regard the king as having abdicated by his flight, and that a new convention should be called to draw up a better constitution. On July 17 this petition was taken to the Champ de Mars (a great open space used for military maneuvers, where the festival had been held during the previous July), and here the people of Paris were called together to sign it. The mayor of Paris disapproved of the affair and decided to disperse the people. He marched out with Lafayette and the national guard and ordered the petitioners to go home. Unhappily the crowd did not take the warnings of the mayor seriously; some stones were thrown at the troops, who were thereupon ordered to fire, and a number of men, women, and children were killed. This unfortunate and quite needless "Massacre of the Champ de Mars" served to weaken the monarchy still farther. It was not forgotten, although the king remained on the throne for a year longer, and Marat, Danton, and Desmoulins were intimidated and thought it prudent to remain in hiding for a time.

The National Assembly gives way to the Legislative Assembly (September, 1791)

It was in the following September that the National Assembly at last put the finishing touches on the constitution which had occupied them for more than two years. The king swore to obey it faithfully, and a general amnesty was proclaimed so that all the discord and suspicion of the past few months might be forgotten. The Assembly then broke up and gave way to the regular congress provided for by the new constitution, — the Legislative Assembly, — which held its first meeting October 1, 1791.

Sources of danger at the opening of the Legislative Assembly, October, 1791

In spite of the great achievements of the National Assembly it left France in a critical situation. Besides the emigrant nobles abroad there were the nonjuring clergy at home, and

ng who was treacherously corresponding with foreign powers

the hope of securing their aid. When the news of the

ture of the king and queen at Varennes reached the ears

of Marie Antoinette's brother, Leopold II, he declared that the

violent arrest of the king sealed with unlawfulness all that had been done in France and "compromised directly the honor of all the sovereigns and the security of every government." He therefore proposed to the rulers of Russia, England, Prussia, Spain, Naples, and Sardinia that they should come to some understanding between themselves as to how they might "reëstablish the liberty and honor of the most Christian king and his family, and place a check upon the dangerous excesses of the French Revolution, the fatal example of which it behooves every government to repress."

The Declaration of Pillnitz, August 27, 1791

On August 27 Leopold, in conjunction with the king of Prussia, had issued the famous Declaration of Pillnitz. In this the two sovereigns state that, in accordance with the wishes of the king's brothers (the leaders of the emigrant nobles), they are ready to join the other European rulers in an attempt to place the king of France in a position to establish a form of government "that shall be once more in harmony with the rights of sovereigns and shall promote the welfare of the French nation." They agreed in the meantime to prepare their troops for active service.

Effect of the Declaration

The Declaration was little more than an empty threat; but it seemed to the French people a sufficient proof that the monarchs were ready to help the seditious French nobles to reëstablish the old régime against the wishes of the nation and at the cost of infinite bloodshed. The idea of foreign rulers intermeddling with their internal affairs would in itself have been intolerable to a proud people like the French, even if the new reforms had not been endangered. Had it been the object of the allied monarchs to hasten instead of to prevent the deposition of Louis XVI, they could hardly have chosen a more efficient means than the Declaration of Pillnitz.

The newspapers

Political excitement and enthusiasm for the Revolution were kept up by the newspapers which had been established, especially in Paris, since the convening of the Estates General. Except in England there had been no daily newspapers before

the French Revolution, and those journals that were issued weekly or at longer intervals had little to say of politics, — commonly a dangerous subject on the Continent. But after 1789 the public did not need longer to rely upon an occasional pamphlet, as was the case earlier. Many journals of the most divergent kinds and representing the most various opinions were published. Some, like the notorious *Friend of the People*, were no more than a periodical editorial written by one man. Others, like the famous *Moniteur*, were much like our papers of to-day and contained news, both foreign and domestic, reports of the debates in the assembly and the text of its decrees, announcements of theaters, etc. The royalists had their organ called *The Acts of the Apostles*, witty and irreverent as the court party itself. Some of the papers were illustrated, and the representations of contemporaneous events, especially the numerous caricatures, are highly diverting.[1]

Of the numerous political clubs, by far the most famous was that of the *Jacobins*. When the Assembly moved into Paris some of the provincial representatives of the third estate rented a large room in the monastery of the Jacobin monks, not far from the building where the National Assembly itself met. A hundred deputies perhaps were present at the first meeting. The next day the number had doubled. The aim of this society was to discuss questions which were about to come before the National Assembly. The club decided at its meetings what should be the policy of its members and how they should vote; and in this way they successfully combined to counteract the schemes of the aristocratic party in the Assembly. The club rapidly grew, and soon admitted to its sessions some who were not deputies. In October, 1791, it decided to permit the public to attend its discussions.

The Jacobins

[1] For example, in one of the caricatures, the formerly despotic king is represented as safely confined by the National Assembly in a huge parrot cage. When asked by his brother-in-law, Leopold II, what he is about, Louis XVI replies, "I am signing my name," — that is, he had nothing to do except meekly to ratify the measures which the Assembly chose to pass.

Gradually similar societies were formed in the provinces.[1] These affiliated themselves with the "mother" society at Paris and kept in constant communication with it. In this way the Jacobins of Paris stimulated and controlled public opinion throughout France and kept the opponents of the old régime alert. When the Legislative Assembly met, the Jacobins had not as yet become republicans but they believed that the king should have hardly more power than the president of a republic. They were even ready to promote his deposition if he failed to stand by the Revolution.

Parties in the Legislative Assembly

The new Legislative Assembly was not well qualified to cope with the many difficulties which faced it. It was made up almost entirely of young and inexperienced men, for the National Assembly, on motion of the virtuous Robespierre, had passed a self-denying ordinance excluding all its members from election to the new body. The Jacobin clubs in the provinces had succeeded in securing the election of a good many of their candidates, sometimes by resorting to violence in order to defeat the more conservative candidates. Consequently the most active and powerful party in the Legislative Assembly was, on the whole, hostile to the king.

The Girondists

Many young and ardent lawyers had been elected, among whom the most prominent were from the department of the Gironde, in which the important city of Bordeaux was situated. They and their followers were called Girondists. They had much to say in their brilliant speeches of the glories of Sparta and of the Roman Republic; they too longed for a republic and inveighed against "tyrants." They applauded the eloquence of their chief orator, Vergniaud, and frequently assembled at the house of the ardent and fascinating Madame Roland to consider the regeneration of their beloved country. But in spite of their enthusiasm they were not statesmen and showed no skill in meeting the troublesome problems that kept arising.

[1] By June, 1791, there were 406 of these affiliated Jacobin clubs. See *Readings*, sect. 37.

The Assembly, not unnaturally, promptly turned its attention to the emigrant nobles. These had been joined by the king's elder brother, the count of Provence, who had managed to escape at the time that the royal family had been arrested at Varennes. Having succeeded in inducing the Emperor and the king of Prussia to issue the Declaration of Pillnitz, they continued to collect troops on the Rhine. The Assembly declared that "the Frenchmen assembled on the frontier" were under suspicion of conspiring against their country. The count of Provence was ordered to return within two months or forfeit any possible claim to the throne.[1] Should the other *émigrés* fail to return to France by January 1, 1792, they were to be regarded as convicted traitors, and punished, if caught, with death; their property was to be confiscated.

The emigrant nobles declared traitors

The harsh treatment of the emigrant nobles was perhaps justified by their desertion and treasonable intrigues; but the conduct of the Assembly toward the clergy was impolitic as well as cruel. Those who had refused to pledge themselves to support a system which was in conflict with their religious convictions and which had been condemned by the Pope were commanded to take the prescribed oath within a week, on penalty of losing their income from the State and being put under surveillance as "suspects." As this failed to bring the clergy to terms, the Assembly later (May, 1792) ordered the deportation from the country of those who steadily persisted in their refusal to accept the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. In this way the Assembly aroused the active hostility of a great part of the most conscientious among the lower clergy, who had loyally supported the commons in their fight against the privileged orders. It also lost the confidence of the great mass of faithful Catholics, — merchants, artisans, and peasants, — who had gladly accepted the abolition of the old abuses, but who would not consent to desert their priests at the bidding of the Assembly.

Harsh measures of the Assembly toward nonjuring clergy

[1] See *Readings*, sect. 37, for the count of Provence's saucy reply.

The Legislative Assembly precipitates a war with Europe

By far the most important act of the Legislative Assembly during the one year of its existence was its precipitation of a war between France and Austria.[1] To many in the Assembly, including the Girondists, it seemed that the existing conditions were intolerable. The emigrant nobles were forming little armies on the boundaries of France and had induced Austria and Prussia to consider interfering in French affairs. The Assembly suspected — what was quite true[2] — that Louis was negotiating with foreign rulers and would be glad to have them intervene and reëstablish him in his old despotic power. The Girondist deputies argued, therefore, that a war against the hated Austria would unite the sympathies of the nation and force the king to show his true character; for he would be obliged either to become the nation's leader or to show himself the traitor they believed him to be.

France declares war on Austria (April 20, 1792)

It was with a heavy heart that Louis XVI, urged on by the clamors of the Girondists, declared war upon Austria on April 20, 1792. Little did the ardent young lawyers of the Assembly surmise that this was the beginning of the most terrific and momentous series of wars that ever swept over Europe, involving, during twenty-three years of almost continuous conflict, every country and people from Ireland to Turkey, and from Norway to Naples. Although the Girondist leaders, Vergniaud, Brissot, Guadet, and their friend Madame Roland, were the first to be destroyed by the storm they had conjured up, could they have looked forward they would have been consoled to see that the tyrants they hated never permanently regained their old power; that the long wars served to bring the principles of the French Revolution home to all the European peoples, everywhere slowly but surely destroyed the old régime, and gave to the people the liberty and the control of the government which the Girondists had so hotly defended.

[1] See *Readings*, sect. 37, for reasons assigned by the French for going to war.

[2] Ibid., for letter of Louis XVI, December 3, 1791, to the king of Prussia, suggesting the intervention of the foreign powers in French affairs.

The French army was in no condition for war. The officers, who, according to the law, were all nobles, had many of them deserted and joined the *émigrés*. The regular troops were consequently demoralized, and the new national guard had not yet been employed except to maintain order in the towns. Naturally Dumouriez, the Girondist minister of war, first turned his attention to the Austrian Netherlands, which promised to be an easy conquest. The reforms of Joseph II and his attempt to make the Netherlands an integral part of the Austrian state had roused a revolt in 1789. It is true that when Leopold II came to the throne and undid his brother's rash changes, all resistance had subsided. Still there was a strong party in the Netherlands which greeted the French Revolution with enthusiasm, and Dumouriez had good reason to think that the attempts made a century before by Louis XIV to add that region to France might at last be successful. But the raw troops that he collected for the invasion of Belgium ran away as soon as they caught sight of Austrian cavalry. The emigrant nobles rejoiced, and Europe concluded that the "patriots" were made of poor stuff.

The French fail in their first attack on the Austrian Netherlands

Meanwhile matters were going badly for the king of France. The Assembly had passed two bills, one ordering those priests who refused to take the oath to the constitution to leave the country within a month; the other directing the formation, just without the walls of Paris, of a camp of twenty thousand volunteers from various parts of France as a protection to the capital. The king resolved, for very good reasons, to veto both of these measures and to dismiss his Girondist ministry, with the exception of Dumouriez, his really able minister of war, who immediately resigned.

The king vetoes two measures of the Legislative Assembly and dismisses his Girondist ministers (May–June, 1792)

All this served to make the king far more unpopular than ever. The "Austrian woman" or "Madame Veto," as the queen was called, was rightly believed to be actively betraying France, and it is now known that she did send to Austria the plan of campaign which had been adopted before the war began.

Rising of June 20, 1792

On June 20 some of the lesser leaders of the Paris populace resolved to celebrate the anniversary of the Tennis-Court oath. They arranged a procession which was permitted to march through the Riding School where the Assembly sat.

The *sans-culottes*

The ensigns of the mob were a calf's heart on the point of a pike, labeled "the heart of an aristocrat," and a pair of knee breeches representing the older costume of a gentleman, which was now going out of fashion since the Girondists, in order to exhibit their democratic sentiments, had adopted the long trousers which had hitherto been worn only by workingmen. To give up knee breeches and become a "sans-culotte," or breeches-less patriot, had come to be considered an unmistakable indication of love for the Revolution.

Invasion of the Tuileries

After visiting the Assembly, the crowd found their way into the neighboring palace of the Tuileries. They wandered through the beautiful apartments shouting, "Down with Monsieur Veto!" The king might have been killed by some ruffian had he not consented to drink to the health of the "nation" — whose representatives were roughly crowding him into the recess of a window — and put on a red "liberty cap," the badge of the "citizen patriots."

Approach of the Prussian army

This invasion of the Tuileries seemed to the European rulers a new and conclusive proof that the Revolution meant anarchy. Had not the populace of Paris treated the king of France as they might have disported themselves with a poor drunken fellow in the street? Prussia had immediately joined Austria when France declared war against the latter in April, and now the army which Frederick the Great had led to victory was moving, under his old general, the duke of Brunswick, toward the French boundary with a view of restoring Louis XVI to his former independent position.

The country declared in danger (July 11, 1792)

The Assembly now declared the country in danger. Every citizen, whether in town or country, was to report, under penalty of imprisonment, what arms or munitions he possessed. The national guards were to select from their ranks

those who could best join the active army. Every citizen was ordered to wear the tricolored cockade, — the red, white, and blue of the Revolution. In this way the peasants, who had been accustomed to regard war as a matter of purely personal interest to kings, were given to understand that they were not now called upon to risk their lives, as formerly, because the Polish king had lost his throne, or because Maria Theresa had a grudge against Frederick the Great. Now, if they shed their blood, it would be to keep out of France two "tyrants" who proposed to force them to surrender the precious reforms of the past three years and restore to the hated runaway nobles their former privileges.

The proclamation of the duke of Brunswick (July 25, 1792)

As the allies approached the French frontier it became clearer and clearer that the king was utterly incapable of defending the country, even if he were willing to oppose the armies which claimed to be coming to his rescue and with which he was believed to be in league. France seemed almost compelled under the circumstances to rid herself of her traitorous and utterly incompetent ruler. The duke of Brunswick, who was in command of the Prussian army, sealed the king's fate by issuing a manifesto in the name of both the Emperor and the king of Prussia, in which he declared that the allies proposed to put an end to anarchy in France and restore the king to his rightful powers; that the inhabitants of France who dared to oppose the Austrian and Prussian troops "shall be punished immediately according to the most stringent laws of war, and their houses shall be burned." If Paris offered the least violence to king or queen, or again permitted the Tuileries to be invaded, the allies promised to "inflict an ever-to-be-remembered vengeance by delivering over the city of Paris to military execution and complete destruction."

The volunteers of Marseilles and their war song

The leaders in Paris now determined to force the Assembly to depose the king. Five hundred members of the national guard of Marseilles were summoned to their aid. This little troop of "patriots" came marching up through France singing

that most stirring of all national hymns, the "Marseillaise," which has ever since borne their name.[1]

The Tuileries again attacked (August 10, 1792)

Danton and other leaders of the insurrection had set their hearts on doing away with the king altogether and establishing a republic. After careful preparations, which were scarcely concealed, the various sections into which Paris was divided arranged to attack the Tuileries on August 10. The men from Marseilles led in this attack. The king, who had been warned, retired from the palace with the queen and the dauphin to the neighboring Riding School where they were respectfully received by the Assembly and assigned a safe place in the newspaper reporters' gallery. The king's Swiss guards fired upon the insurgents, but were overpowered and almost all of them slain. Then the ruffianly element in the mob ransacked the palace and killed the servants. Napoleon Bonaparte, an unknown lieutenant who was watching affairs from across the river, declared that the palace could easily have been defended

[1] This famous song was not meant originally as a republican chant. It had been composed a few months before by Rouget de Lisle at Strassburg. War had just been declared, and it was designed to give heart to the French army on the Rhine. The "tyrants" it refers to were the foreign kings Frederick William II of Prussia and the Emperor, who were attacking France, not Louis XVI. The "Marseillaise" begins as follows:

Allons, enfants de la patrie,
Le jour de gloire est arrivé;
Contre nous de la tyrannie
L'étendard sanglant est levé. (repeat)
Entendez-vous, dans ces campagnes,
Mugir ces féroces soldats?
Ils viennent jusque dans vos bras
Égorger vos fils, vos compagnes!
Aux armes, citoyens! formez vos bataillons!
Marchons, qu'un sang impure abreuve nos sillons.

Que veut cette horde d'esclaves,
De traîtres, de rois conjurés?
Pour qui ces ignobles entraves,
Ces fers dès longtemps préparés? (repeat)
Français, pour nous, ah! quel outrage!
Quels transports il doit exciter!
C'est nous qu'on ose méditer
De rendre à l'antique esclavage!
Aux armes, citoyens! formez vos bataillons!
Marchons, qu'un sang impure abreuve nos sillons.

had not the commander of the guards been brutally murdered before hostilities opened.[1]

The revolutionary commune of Paris

Meanwhile the representatives of the various quarters of Paris had taken possession of the City Hall. They pushed the members of the municipal council off their seats and took their places. In this way a new revolutionary commune was formed, which seized the government of the capital and then sent messengers to demand that the Assembly dethrone the king.

Attitude of the Legislative Assembly

The Assembly refused to abolish kingship, but "suspended" the monarch and put him under guard. They regarded the attack on the Tuileries merely as a reply to the threats of the allies, and endeavored to reassure Europe by proclaiming that France had no idea of making any conquests, but desired to secure the brotherhood of mankind. To illustrate this universal brotherhood, the privileges of French citizenship were conferred upon a number of distinguished foreigners, — Priestley, Wilberforce, Schiller, Washington, and Kosciusko among others. The suffrage in France, which had been limited by the previous Assembly to the citizens who could pay taxes equal to three days' labor, was extended to all, rich and poor alike. Lastly, a new ministry was formed in which Danton, the most conspicuous leader in the insurrection, was made minister of justice.

Three days later a decree which had been proposed by Vergniaud was passed, summoning a national convention to

[1] Of the many patriotic songs which express the spirit of the people during the Revolution, the famous "Carmagnole," which deals with the events of August 10, may be cited. It begins:

Madame Veto avait promis,
Madame Veto avait promis,
De faire égorger tout Paris,
De faire égorger tout Paris.
Mais le coup a manqué
Grâce à nos cannoniers!
Dansons la Carmagnole!
Vive le son, vive le son,
Dansons la Carmagnole,
Vive le son du canon!

Why monarchy was doomed in France

draft a new constitution. Although a great part of France was still loyal to the monarchy, it was evident that under the circumstances this convention would be forced to establish a republic. What else could it do? The king and queen were in league with the foreign enemy whom the king's two brothers had induced to invade France. The natural heir to the throne was a boy of seven to whose weak hands it was impossible to intrust the public welfare. These were strong arguments for the republican leaders and newspaper editors, especially as they had behind them the resolute insurrectionary commune of Paris. France must find a substitute for her ancient kings, who had come to seem little better than the feudal lords of whom they had been, after all, the chief. In short, the monarchial constitution which had not yet been in force a year had already become an anachronism.

Appalling task of the Convention

So the Legislative Assembly gave way to the Convention, whose task was truly appalling since it had not only to draft a new constitution to suit both monarchists and republicans, but to conduct the government, repel invading armies, keep down the Paris mob, — in a word, see France through the Reign of Terror.

The Reign of Terror

France proclaimed a republic (September 22, 1792)

38. The Convention met on the 21st of September, and its first act was to abolish the ancient monarchy and proclaim France a republic. It seemed to the enthusiasts of the time that a new era of liberty had dawned, now that the long oppression by "despots" was ended forever. The twenty-second day of September, 1792, was reckoned as the first day of the Year One of French Liberty.[1]

[1] A committee of the Convention was appointed to draw up a new republican calendar. The year was divided into twelve months of thirty days each. The five days preceding September 22, at the end of the year, were holidays. Each month was divided into three *décades*, and each "tenth day" (*décadi*) was a holiday. The days were no longer dedicated to saints, but to agricultural implements, vegetables, domestic animals, etc.

The September massacres (1792)

Meanwhile the usurping Paris commune had taken matters into its own hands and had brought discredit upon the cause of liberty by one of the most atrocious acts in history. On the pretext that Paris was full of traitors who sympathized with the Austrians and the emigrant nobles, they had filled the prisons with three thousand citizens, including many of the priests who had refused to take the oath required by the Constitution. On September 2 and 3, hundreds of these were executed with scarcely a pretense of a trial. The excuse offered was: "How can we go away to the war and leave behind us three thousand prisoners who may break out and destroy our wives and our children!" The members of the commune who perpetrated this deed probably hoped to terrify those who might still dream of returning to the old system of government.

The Prussian army checked at Valmy

Late in August the Prussians crossed the French boundary and on September 2 took the fortress of Verdun. It now seemed as if there was nothing to prevent their marching upon Paris. The French general, Dumouriez, blocked the advance of the Prussian army, however, at Valmy, scarcely a hundred miles from the capital, and forced the enemy to retreat without fighting a pitched battle. Notwithstanding the fear of the French, King Frederick William II of Prussia (who had succeeded his uncle, Frederick the Great, six years before) had but little interest in the war. As for the Austrian troops, they were lagging far behind, for both powers were far more absorbed in a second partition of Poland, which was approaching, than in the fate of the French king.

The French occupy Savoy, the Rhine valley, and the Netherlands

The French were able, therefore, in spite of their disorganization, not only to expel the Prussians but to carry the Revolution beyond the bounds of France. They invaded Germany and took several important towns on the Rhine, including Mayence, which gladly opened its gates to them. They also occupied Savoy on the southeast. Then Dumouriez led his barefooted, ill-equipped volunteers into the Austrian Netherlands.

This time they did not run away, but, shouting the "Marseillaise," they defeated the Austrians at Jemappes (November 6) and were soon in possession of the whole country.

How the Convention proposed to spread the Revolution abroad (December 15, 1792)

The Convention now proposed to use its armies to revolutionize Europe. It issued a proclamation addressed to the peoples of the countries that France was occupying: "We have driven out your tyrants. Show yourselves freemen and we will protect you from their vengeance." Feudal dues, unjust taxes, and all the burdens which had been devised by the "tyrants" were forthwith abolished, and the French nation declared that it would treat as enemies every people who, "refusing liberty and equality, or renouncing them, may wish to maintain or recall its prince or the privileged classes."[1]

Trial and execution of the king (January, 1793)

Meanwhile the Convention was puzzled to determine what would best be done with the king. A considerable party felt that he was guilty of treason in secretly encouraging the foreign powers to come to his aid. He was therefore brought to trial, and when it came to a final vote he was, by a small majority, condemned to death. He mounted the scaffold on January 21, 1793, with the fortitude of a martyr. Nevertheless it cannot be denied that, through his earlier weakness and indecision, he brought untold misery upon his own kingdom and upon Europe at large. The French people had not dreamed of a republic until his absolute incompetence forced them, in self-defense, to abolish the monarchy in the hope of securing a more efficient government.

The execution of Louis XVI solidifies the alliance against France

The execution of Louis XVI had immediate and unhappy effects. The Convention had thrown down the head of their king as a challenge to the "despots" of Europe; the monarchs accepted the challenge and the French republic soon found all the powers of Europe ranged against it. Nowhere did the tragic event of January 21 produce more momentous results than in England. George III went into mourning and ordered the French envoy to be expelled from the kingdom;

[1] This decree may be found in the *Readings*, sect. 38.

even Pitt, forgetting the work of Cromwell and the Puritan revolutionists, declared the killing of the French king to be the most awful and atrocious crime in all recorded history. All England's old fears of French aggression were aroused. It was clear that the Republic was bent upon carrying out the plans of Louis XIV for annexing the Austrian Netherlands and Holland and thereby extending her frontiers to the Rhine. Indeed there was no telling where the excited nation, in its fanatical hatred of kings, would stop.

Pitt declares that England must oppose the Revolution

On February 1 Pitt made a speech in the House of Commons in which he accused the French of having broken their promises not to conquer their neighbors or mix in their affairs. They had seized the Netherlands and had declared the river Scheldt open to commerce although it had been closed by the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) in the interests of the Dutch ports. They had already occupied Savoy and now threatened Holland. They loudly proclaimed their intention to free all peoples from the dominion of their rulers. Consequently the Revolution was, Pitt urged, incompatible with the peace of Europe, and England must in honor join the allies and save Europe from falling under the yoke of France.[1]

France declares war on England (February 1, 1793) and gives her reasons

On the same day that Pitt made his speech, the French Convention boldly declared war upon England and Holland on the ground that "the king of England has not ceased, especially since the Revolution of August 10, 1792, to give the French nation proofs of his ill-will and his attachment to the coalition of crowned heads." He had expelled the French envoy, flooded France with forged *assignats*, prevented grain from reaching French ports, and drawn the "servile" Dutch Stadholder into an alliance against France. No one could have foreseen that England, the last of the European powers to join the coalition against France, was to prove her most

[1] Many Englishmen sympathized with the Revolution. Against Pitt's arguments some of the Whigs, especially Fox, urged in vain the bloody manifesto of the duke of Brunswick which had maddened the French, and the atrocious conduct of the allies in the partition of Poland upon which they were just then engaged.

persistent enemy. For over twenty years the struggle was to continue, until an English ship carried Napoleon Bonaparte to his island prison.

Second partition of Poland (1793)

Catharine the Great abhorred the revolutionists, but she had contented herself with encouraging Austria and Prussia to fight for Louis XVI and the rights of monarchs in general, while she prepared to seize more than her share of Poland. Frederick William and the Emperor were well aware of her plans, and consequently felt that they must keep their eyes on her rather than move on Paris. This accounts, in a measure, for the ease with which the French had repulsed the allies and taken possession of the Austrian Netherlands in the autumn of 1792. It was in the following January that Prussia and Russia arranged the second partition of Poland. Austria, as has been explained,[1] was treated very shabbily and forced to go without her share on the flimsy pretense that Frederick William and Catharine would use their good offices to induce the elector of Bavaria to exchange his possessions for the Austrian Netherlands, — which were at that moment in the hands of Dumouriez's republican troops.

French driven from the Netherlands; desertion of Dumouriez

This adjustment of the differences between the allies gave a wholly new aspect to the war with France. When, in March, 1793, Spain and the Holy Roman Empire joined the coalition, France was at war with all her neighbors. The Austrians defeated Dumouriez at Neerwinden, March 18, and drove the French out of the Netherlands. Thereupon Dumouriez, disgusted by the failure of the Convention to support him and by their execution of the king, and angered by the outrageous manner in which their commissioners levied contributions from the people to whom they had brought "liberty," deserted to the enemy with a few hundred soldiers who consented to follow him.

Encouraged by this success, the allies began to consider partitioning France as they had Poland. Austria might take

[1] See above, p. 78.

the northern regions for herself and then assign Alsace and Lorraine to Bavaria in exchange for the Bavarian territory on her boundaries, which Austria had long wished to annex. England could have Dunkirk and what remained of the French colonies. A Russian diplomat suggested that Spain and the king of Sardinia should also help themselves. "This done, let us all work in concert to give what remains of France a stable and permanent monarchical government. She will in this way become a second-rate power which will harm no one, and we shall get rid of this democratic firebrand which threatens to set Europe aflame."

The allies consider a possible partition of France

The loss of the Netherlands and the treason of their best general made a deep impression upon the members of the Convention. If the new French republic was to defend itself against the "tyrants" without and its many enemies within, it could not wait for the Convention to draw up an elaborate, permanent constitution. An efficient government must be devised immediately to maintain the loyalty of the nation to the republic, and to raise and equip armies and direct their commanders. The Convention accordingly put the government into the hands of a small committee, consisting originally of nine, later of twelve, of its members. This famous Committee of Public Safety was given practically unlimited powers. "We must," one of the leaders exclaimed, "establish the despotism of liberty in order to crush the despotism of kings."

The French government put in the hands of the Committee of Public Safety, April, 1793

Within the Convention itself there was dissension, especially between two groups of active men who came into bitter conflict over the policy to be pursued. There was, first, the party of the Girondists, led by Vergniaud, Brissot, and others. They were enthusiastic republicans and counted among their numbers some speakers of remarkable eloquence. The Girondists had enjoyed the control of the Legislative Assembly in 1792 and had been active in bringing on the war with Austria and Prussia. They hoped in that way to complete the Revolution by exposing the bad faith of the king and his sympathy with the

The Girondists

emigrant nobles. They were not, however, men of sufficient decision to direct affairs in the terrible difficulties in which France found herself after the execution of the king. They consequently lost their influence, and a new party, called the "Mountain" from the high seats that they occupied in the Convention, gained the ascendency.

The extreme republicans, called the "Mountain"

This was composed of the most vigorous and uncompromising republicans, like Danton, Robespierre, and Saint-Just, who had obtained control of the Jacobin clubs and were supported by the commune of Paris. They believed that the French people had been depraved by the slavery to which their kings had subjected them. Everything, they argued, which suggested the former rule of kings must be wiped out. A new France should be created, in which liberty, equality, and fraternity should take the place of the tyranny of princes, the insolence of nobles, and the impostures of the priests. The leaders of the Mountain held that the mass of the people were by nature good and upright, but that there were a number of adherents of the old system who would, if they could, undo the great work of the Revolution and lead the people back to slavery under king and Church. All who were suspected by the Mountain of having the least sympathy with the nobles or the persecuted priests were branded as "counter-revolutionary." The Mountain was willing to resort to any measures, however shocking, to rid the nation of those suspected of counter-revolutionary tendencies, and its leaders relied upon the populace of Paris to aid them in carrying out their designs.

Girondist leaders expelled from the Convention, June 2, 1793

The Girondists, on the other hand, abhorred the restless populace of Paris and the fanatics who composed the commune of the capital. They argued that Paris was not France, and that it had no right to assume a despotic rule over the nation. They proposed that the commune should be dissolved and that the Convention should remove to another town where they would not be subject to the intimidation of the Paris mob. The Mountain thereupon accused the Girondists of an attempt

to break up the republic, "one and indivisible," by questioning the supremacy of Paris and the duty of the provinces to follow the lead of the capital. The mob, thus encouraged, rose against the Girondists. On June 2 it surrounded the meeting place of the Convention, and deputies of the commune demanded the expulsion from the Convention of the Girondist leaders, who were placed under arrest.

France threatened with civil war

The conduct of the Mountain and its ally, the Paris commune, now began to arouse opposition in various parts of France, and the country was threatened with civil war at a time when it was absolutely necessary that all Frenchmen should combine in the loyal defense of their country against the invaders who were again approaching its boundaries.

The revolt of the peasants of Brittany against the Convention

The first and most serious opposition came from the peasants of Brittany, especially in the department of La Vendée. There the people still loved the monarchy and their priests, and even the nobles; they refused to send their sons to fight for a republic which had killed their king and was persecuting those clergymen who declined to take an oath which their conscience forbade.

Revolt of the cities against the Convention

The cities of Marseilles and Bordeaux were indignant at the treatment to which the Girondist deputies were subjected in Paris, and they also organized a revolt against the Convention. In the manufacturing city of Lyons the merchants hated the Jacobins and their republic, since the demand for silk and other luxuries produced at Lyons had come from the nobility and clergy, who were now no longer in a position to buy. The prosperous classes were therefore exasperated when the commissioners of the Convention demanded money and troops. The citizens gathered an army of ten thousand men, placed it under a royalist leader, and prepared to bid defiance to the Jacobins who controlled the Convention.

Meanwhile France's enemies were again advancing against her. The Austrians laid siege to the border fortress of Condé, which they captured on July 10, 1793, and two weeks later

French fortresses fall into the hands of Austria and England (July, 1793)

the English took Valenciennes. In this way the allies gained a foothold in France itself. Once more they were hardly more than a hundred miles away from the capital, and there appeared to be no reason why they should not immediately march upon Paris and wreak the vengeance which the duke of Brunswick had threatened in his proclamation of the previous year. The Prussians had driven the French garrison out of Mayence and were ready to advance into Alsace. Toulon, the great naval station of southern France, now revolted against the Convention. It proclaimed the little dauphin as king, under the title of Louis XVII, and welcomed the English fleet as an ally.

Carnot organizes the French armies

The French Republic seemed to be lost; but never did a body of men exhibit such marvelous energy as the Committee of Public Safety. Carnot, who was to earn the title of Organizer of Victory, became a member of the committee in August. He immediately called for a general levy of troops and soon had no less than seven hundred and fifty thousand men. These he divided into thirteen armies which he dispatched against the allies. Each general was accompanied by two "deputies on mission" who were always on the watch lest the commanders desert, as Lafayette had done after August 10, 1792, and Dumouriez a few months later. These Jacobin deputies not only roused the patriotism of the raw recruits, but they let it be known that for a general to lose a battle meant death.

The French easily repulse the allies

Fortunately for the Convention the allies did not march on Paris, but Austria began occupying the border towns and the English moved westward to seize the coveted Dunkirk. The French were able to drive off the English and Hanoverians who were besieging Dunkirk, and in October General Jourdan defeated the Austrians at Wattignies. Since Frederick William continued to give his attention mainly to Poland, there was little danger from the duke of Brunswick and his army, so that by the close of 1793 all danger from foreign invasion was over for the time being.

As for the revolt of the cities and of the Vendean peasants, the Committee of Public Safety showed itself able to cope with that danger too. It first turned its attention to Lyons. Some of the troops from the armies on the frontiers were recalled and the city was bombarded and captured. Then Collot d'Herbois, one of the stanchest believers in terrorism, was sent down to demonstrate to the conquered city what a fearful thing it was to rise against the Mountain. Nearly two thousand persons were executed, or rather massacred, as traitors, within five months. Indeed the Convention declared its intention to annihilate the great and flourishing city and rename its site Freedville (*Commune affranchie*). Happily a close friend of Robespierre, who was sent to execute this decree, contented himself with destroying forty houses.

The revolt of the cities suppressed by the Committee of Public Safety

Frightened by the awful fate of Lyons, the cities of Bordeaux and Marseilles judged it useless to oppose the Convention and admitted its representatives, who executed three or four hundred "traitors" in each place. Toulon held out until an artillery officer hitherto entirely unknown, a young Corsican by the name of Napoleon Bonaparte, suggested occupying a certain promontory in the harbor, from which he was able to train his cannon on the British fleet which was supporting the city. It sailed away with some refugees, leaving the town to the vengeance of the Convention, December 19, 1793.

Bonaparte at Toulon

Although the Vendean peasants fought bravely and defeated several corps of the national guard sent against them, their insurrection was also put down in the autumn — at least for a time — with atrocious cruelty. A representative of the Convention at Nantes had perhaps two thousand Vendean insurgents shot or drowned in the Loire. This was probably the most horrible episode of the Revolution, and was not approved by the Convention, which recalled its bloodthirsty agent, who was finally sent to the scaffold for his crimes.

Defeat of the peasants of the Vendée

In spite of the extraordinary success with which the Committee of Public Safety had crushed its opponents at home and

The Reign of Terror

repelled the armies of the monarchs who proposed to dismember France, it was clear that the task of rendering the Revolution complete and permanent was by no means accomplished. The revolt of the Vendée and of the cities had shown that there were thousands of Frenchmen who hated the Jacobins. All such were viewed by the Convention as guilty of holding counter-revolutionary sentiments and therefore "suspect." It was argued that any one who was not an ardent and demonstrative *sans-culotte* might at any time become a traitor. In order to prevent this and force people to be faithful to the republic, the Convention decided that they must be terrorized by observing the fearful vengeance which the republic wrought upon traitors. The Reign of Terror was only a systematic attempt to secure the success of the Revolution by summarily punishing or intimidating its enemies. While it had no definite beginning or end, it lasted, in its more acute stages, for about ten months, — from September, 1793 to July, 1794.

The Revolutionary Tribunal

Even before the fall of the Girondists a special court had been established in Paris, known as the Revolutionary Tribunal. Its function was to try all those who were suspected of treasonable acts. At first the cases were very carefully considered and few persons were condemned. In September, after the revolt of the cities, two new men who had been implicated in the September massacres were added to the Committee of Public Safety. They were selected with the particular purpose of intimidating the counter-revolutionary party by bringing all the disaffected to the guillotine.[1] A terrible law was passed, declaring all those to be suspects who by their conduct or remarks had shown themselves enemies of liberty. The former nobles, including the wives, fathers, mothers, and children of the "emigrants,"

[1] In former times it had been customary to inflict capital punishment by decapitating the victim with a sword. At the opening of the Revolution a certain Dr. Guillotin recommended a new device, which consisted of a heavy knife sliding downward between two uprights. This instrument, called after him the guillotine, which has until very recently been used in France, was more speedy and certain in its action than the sword in the hands of the executioner.

unless they had constantly manifested their attachment to the Revolution, were ordered to be imprisoned.

Execution of Marie Antoinette (October, 1793)

In October Marie Antoinette, after a trial in which false and atrocious charges were urged against her in addition to the treasonable acts of which she had been guilty, was executed in Paris. A number of high-minded and distinguished persons, including Madame Roland and a group of Girondists, suffered a like fate. But the most horrible acts of the Reign of Terror were, as has been noted, perpetrated in the provinces, especially at Lyons and Nantes.

Schism in the party of the Mountain

It was not long before the members of the radical party who were conducting the government began to disagree among themselves. Danton, a man of fiery zeal for the republic, who had hitherto enjoyed great popularity with the Jacobins, became tired of bloodshed and convinced that the system of terror was no longer necessary. Camille Desmoulins, another ardent republican, began to attack the harsher Jacobins as he had earlier attacked the unpractical Girondists. He started a witty but very serious little newspaper, called *The Old Cordelier*, in the interests of moderation.

The *Vieux Cordelier* of Desmoulins

Desmoulins began by showing that the severities of the Reign of Terror were, after all, as nothing compared with the atrocities of the earlier Roman emperors which one read about in Tacitus. "Vice, pillage, and crime are diseases in republics, whereas rogues are absolutely necessary to the maintenance of a monarchy." In his next issue he ceased to extenuate the work of the guillotine and pleaded for clemency. "You would exterminate all your enemies by the guillotine! What madness! Can you possibly destroy one enemy on the scaffold without making ten others among his family and friends?" The strong and courageous, as Desmoulins urged, had emigrated or perished at Lyons or in the Vendée. The cowardly or sick who remained were no source of danger. So Terror should no longer be the order of the day, and a committee of clemency should take the place of the revolutionary army that

was traveling about the country with a movable guillotine. "This committee of clemency," he said, "will complete the Revolution, for clemency itself is a revolutionary measure, the most efficient of all, when it is wisely dealt out."[1]

Hébert and the ultra-radicals

On the other hand, the radical leader of the Paris commune, Hébert, had also his newspaper, an indecent sheet which called on the people to complete the Revolution. He proposed that the worship of Reason should be substituted for that of God and arranged a service in the cathedral of Notre Dame where Reason, in the person of a handsome actress, took her place on the altar.

Robespierre and Saint-Just

Robespierre, who was a member of the Committee of Public Safety, sympathized neither with the moderates nor with Hébert and his Goddess of Reason. He himself enjoyed a great reputation for high ideals, republican virtue, and incorruptibility. He and Saint-Just had read their Rousseau with prayerful attention and dreamed of a glorious republic in which there should be neither rich nor poor; in which men and women should live in independence and rear robust and healthy children. These should be turned over to the republic at five years of age to be educated in Spartan fashion by the nation; they were to eat together and to live on roots, fruit, vegetables, milk, cheese, bread, and water. The Eternal was to be worshiped in temples, and in these temples at certain times every man should be required publicly to state who were his friends. Any man who said he had no friends, or was convicted of ingratitude, was to be banished.[2]

Robespierre has the leaders of both the moderates and extremists executed (March and April, 1794)

Robespierre was, however, insignificant and unattractive in person and a tiresome speaker. He had none of the magnetism of Danton and none of the wit and charm of Desmoulins. He coldly advocated the execution of these two former associates for attempting to betray the republic and frustrate the

[1] See extracts from *The Old Cordelier* in *Readings*, sect. 38.

[2] See *Readings*, sect. 38, for extracts from Saint-Just's book on *Republican Institutions*.

Revolution by their ill-timed moderation. On the other hand, as a deist, he believed that Hébert and his followers were discrediting the Revolution by their atheism. Accordingly, through his influence, the leaders of both the moderate and the extreme parties were arrested and sent to the guillotine (March and April, 1794).

Robespierre's brief period of influence

Robespierre now enjoyed a brief dictatorship. He read in the Convention a report on a system of festivals which were to help regenerate the land by celebrating such abstractions as liberty, equality, glory, immortality, frugality, stoicism, and old age. He had a decree passed proclaiming that the French nation believed in God and the immortality of the soul, and organized a ceremony in honor of the Supreme Being in which he himself assumed a very conspicuous rôle as a sort of high priest of deism. The Convention was so far in sympathy with the aspirations of Robespierre and Saint-Just as to assert that "it is necessary to refashion a people completely if it is to be made free. Its prejudices must be destroyed, its habits changed, its needs limited, its vices eradicated, and its desires purified. Strong forces must be invoked to develop social virtues and repress the passions of men."

Law of 22d Prairial heightens the Reign of Terror

In order the more effectively to destroy his enemies and those who opposed his designs for the regeneration of society, Robespierre had the Revolutionary Tribunal divided into four sections (June 10, 1794), so that it could work far more rapidly than hitherto. It could condemn any suspected "enemy of the people" on almost any evidence. The accused were in many cases deprived of counsel and no witnesses were examined. The result was that in seven weeks thirteen hundred and seventy-six persons were sent to the guillotine in Paris, whereas only eleven hundred and sixty-five had been executed from December 1 of the previous year to the passage of Robespierre's terrible new law in June.

It was of course impossible for Robespierre to maintain his power long. Many of his colleagues in the Convention began

Fall of Robespierre on the 9th Thermidor (July 27, 1794)

to fear that they might at any moment follow Danton and Hébert to the guillotine. They did not sympathize very deeply with Robespierre's ideas; as one of the most ardent terrorists said, "Robespierre begins to bore me with his Supreme Being." A conspiracy was formed against him and the Convention was induced to order his arrest. When, on July 27, — the 9th Thermidor of the new republican calendar,— he appeared in the Convention and attempted to speak he was silenced by cries of "Down with the tyrant!" In his consternation he could not at first recover his voice, whereupon one of the deputies shouted, "The blood of Danton chokes him!" Finally he called upon the commune of Paris to defend him, but the Convention was able to maintain its authority and to send Robespierre and Saint-Just, his fellow-idealist, to the guillotine. It is sad enough that two of the most sincere and upright of all the revolutionists should, in their misguided and over-earnest efforts to better the condition of their fellow-men, have become objects of execration to posterity.

Reaction after the overthrow of Robespierre

In successfully overthrowing Robespierre the Convention and Committee of Public Safety had rid the country of the only man who, owing to his popularity and his reputation for uprightness, could have prolonged the Reign of Terror. There was almost an immediate reaction after his death, for the country was weary of executions. The Revolutionary Tribunal henceforth convicted very few indeed of those who were brought before it. It made an exception, however, of those who had themselves been the leaders in the worst atrocities, as, for example, the public prosecutor, who had brought hundreds of victims to the guillotine in Paris, and the terrorists who had ordered the massacres at Nantes and Lyons. Within a few months the Jacobin Club at Paris was closed by the Convention and the commune of Paris abolished.

Review of the Reign of Terror

The importance and nature of the Reign of Terror are so commonly misunderstood that it is worth our while to stop a moment to reconsider it as a whole. When the Estates

General met, the people of France were loyal to their king but wished to establish a more orderly government; they wanted to vote the taxes, have some share in making the laws, and abolish the old feudal abuses, including the unreasonable privileges of the nobility and the clergy. The nobility were frightened and began to run away. The king and queen urged foreign powers to intervene and even tried to escape to join the traitorous emigrant nobles. Austrian and Prussian troops reached the frontier and the Prussian commander threatened to destroy Paris unless the royal family were given complete liberty. Paris, aided by the men of Marseilles, retaliated by deposing the king, and the Convention decided by a narrow majority to execute Louis XVI for treason, of which he was manifestly guilty. In the summer, just as Austria and England were taking the French border fortresses of Condé and Valenciennes, the cities of Lyons, Marseilles, and Toulon and the peasants of the Vendée revolted. The necessity of making head against invasion and putting down the insurrection at home led to harsh measures on the part of the Convention and its Committee of Public Safety. First stage

When the immediate danger was dispelled Robespierre, Saint-Just, and others sought to exterminate the enemies of that utopian republic of which they dreamed and in which every man was to have a fair chance in life. This led to the second, and perhaps less excusable, phase of the Reign of Terror. To the executions sanctioned by the government must be added the massacres and lynchings perpetrated by mobs or by irresponsible agents of the Convention. Yet Camille Desmoulins was right when he claimed that the blood that had flowed "for the eternal emancipation of a nation of twenty-five millions" was as nothing to that shed by the Roman emperors (and it may be added, by bishops and kings), often in less worthy causes. Second stage

Then it should be remembered that a great part of the French people were nearly or quite unaffected by the Reign

A great part of the French people unaffected by the Reign of Terror

of Terror. In Paris very few of the citizens stood in any fear of the guillotine. The city was not the gloomy place that it has been pictured by Dickens and other story-tellers. Never did the inhabitants appear happier than when the country was being purged of the supposed traitors; never were the theaters and restaurants more crowded. The guillotine was making way with the enemies of liberty, so the women wore tiny guillotines as ornaments, and the children were given toy guillotines and amused themselves decapitating the figures of "aristocrats."

Sound reforms introduced by the Convention

Moreover the Convention had by no means confined its attention during the months of the Reign of Terror to hunting down "suspects" and executing traitors. Its committees had raised a million troops, organized and equipped them with arms, and sent them forth to victory. The reforms sketched out by the National Assembly had been developed and carried on. The Convention had worked out a great system of elementary education which should form the basis of the new republic. It had drafted a new code of laws which should replace the confusion of the *ancien régime*, although it was left for Napoleon to order its revision and gain the credit of the enterprise. The republican calendar was not destined to survive, but the rational system of weights and measures known as the metric system, which the Convention introduced, has been adopted by most of the nations of Continental Europe and is used by men of science in England and America.

The metric system

Anxiety of the Convention to blot out all suggestions of the past

In its anxiety to obliterate every suggestion of the old order of things, the Convention went to excess. The old terms of address, Monsieur and Madame, seemed to smack of the *ancien régime* and so were replaced by "citizen" and "citizeness." The days were no longer dedicated to St. Peter, St. James, St. Bridget, or St. Catharine, but to the cow, the horse, celery, the turnip, the harrow, the pitchfork, or other useful creature or utensil. The Place Louis XV became Place de la Revolution. Throne Square was rechristened Place of the Overturned

Throne. The Convention endeavored to better the condition of the poor man and deprive the rich of their superfluity. The land which had been taken from the Church and the runaway nobles was sold in small parcels and the number of small landholders was thus greatly increased. In May, 1793, the Convention tried to keep down the price of grain by passing the Law of the Maximum, which forbade the selling of grain and flour at a higher price than that fixed by each commune. This was later extended to other forms of food and worked quite as badly as the grain laws which Turgot had abolished.

The Convention's efforts to improve the condition of the poorer classes

The reckless increase of the paper currency, or *assignats*, and the efforts to prevent their depreciation by a law which made it a capital offense to refuse to accept them at par caused infinite confusion. There were about forty billions of francs of these *assignats* in circulation at the opening of the year 1796. At that time it required nearly three hundred francs in paper to procure one in specie.

Trouble with depreciated paper money

At last the Convention turned its attention once more to the special work for which it had been summoned in September, 1792, and drew up a constitution for the republic. This was preceded by a "Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man and the Citizen," which summed up, as the first Declaration of Rights had done, the great principles of the Revolution.[1] The lawmaking power is vested by the Constitution of the Year III in a Legislative Body to be composed of two chambers, the Council of Five Hundred and the Council of the Elders (consisting of two hundred and fifty members). Members of the latter were to be at least forty years old and either married or widowers. Practically all men over twenty-one years of age were permitted to vote for the members of the electoral colleges, which in turn chose the members of the

Constitution of the Year III

[1] All the duties of man and the citizen are derived, according to this constitution, from two principles which are graven by nature in the hearts of all: Ne faites pas à autrui ce que vous ne voudriez pas qu'on vous fît. Faites constamment aux autres le bien que vous voudriez en recevoir. This is after all only an amplification of the Golden Rule.

The Directory

Legislative Body. To take the place of a king, a Directory composed of five members chosen by the Legislative Body was invested with the executive power. One director was to retire each year, as well as one third of the members of the Legislative Body (a system suggesting that of the United States Senate).

Opposition to the convention

Before the Convention completed the constitution its enemies had become very strong. The richer classes had once more got the upper hand; they abhorred the Convention which had killed their king and oppressed them, and they favored the reëstablishment of the monarchy without the abuses of the *ancien régime*. The Convention, fearing for itself and the republic, decreed that in the approaching election, at least two thirds of the new Legislative Body were to be chosen from the existing members of the Convention. Believing that it could rely upon the armies, it ordered that the constitution should be submitted to the soldiers for ratification and that bodies of troops should be collected near Paris to maintain order during the elections. These decrees roused the anger of the wealthier districts of Paris which did not hesitate to organize a revolt and prepare to attack the Convention.

The 13th Vendémiaire (October 5, 1795)

The latter, however, chose for its defender that same Napoleon Bonaparte who, after helping to take Toulon, had resigned his commission rather than leave the artillery and join the infantry as he had been ordered to do, and was earning a bare subsistence as a clerk in a government office. Bonaparte stationed the regulars around the building in which the Convention sat and then loaded his cannon with grapeshot. When the bourgeois national guard attacked him, he gave the order to fire and easily swept them from the streets.[1] The royalists were defeated. The day had been saved for the Convention by the army and by a military genius who was destined soon not only to make himself master of France but to build up an empire comprising a great part of western Europe.

[1] More people were killed on the 13th Vendémiaire than on August 10, 1792, when the monarchy was overthrown.

REFERENCES

End of the National Assembly: MATHEWS, *French Revolution*, chap. xiii, pp. 166–181; STEPHENS, *History of the French Revolution*, Vol. I, chap. xv, pp. 434–470; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, pp. 199–210.

Opening of the War with Europe: MATHEWS, pp. 182–195; STEPHENS, Vol. II, pp. 27–44; FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 28–40.

Conditions in Europe in 1792: FYFFE, chap. i, pp. 1–27.

Tenth of August and the September Massacres: STEPHENS, Vol. II, chap. iv, pp. 107–150; MATHEWS, pp. 195–206; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, pp. 228–244.

Establishment of the Republic: MATHEWS, chap. xv, pp. 207–224; STEPHENS, Vol. II, chap. v, pp. 151–180.

Reign of Terror in Paris: STEPHENS, Vol. II, chap. x, pp. 321–361; MATHEWS, chap. xvi, pp. 224–233; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. xii, pp. 338–371.

Reign of Terror in the Provinces: MATHEWS, chap. xvii, pp. 234–251; STEPHENS, Vol. II, chap. xi, pp. 362–414.

Robespierre: MATHEWS, chap. xviii, pp. 252–265.

Reaction after Thermidor: MATHEWS, chap. xix, pp. 266–285; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. xiii, pp. 372–397.

Course of the War to 1795: FYFFE, chap. ii, pp. 28–73; *Cambridge Modern History*, chap. xiv, pp. 398–446.

CHAPTER XIV

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

BONAPARTE'S FIRST ITALIAN CAMPAIGN

How the Revolution transformed and democratized the army

39. The French army had undergone a complete transformation during the Revolution. The rules of the *ancien régime* had required all officers to be nobles, and many of these had left France after the fall of the Bastille. Others, like Lafayette and Dumouriez, who had at first favored the Revolution, deserted soon after the opening of the war. Still others, like Custine and Beauharnais (the Empress Josephine's first husband), were executed because the "deputies on mission" believed that they were responsible for the defeats that the armies of the French republic had suffered.

The former rigid discipline disappeared, and the hundreds of thousands of volunteers who pressed forward to defend and extend the boundaries of the Republic found new leaders, who rose from the ranks, and who hit upon novel and quite unconventional ways of beating the enemy. Any one might now become a general if he could prove his ability to lead troops to victory. Moreau was a lawyer from Brittany, Murat had been a waiter, Jourdan before the Revolution had been selling cloth in Limoges. In short, the army, like the State, had become democratic.

The Napoleonic Period

Among the commanders who by means of their talents rose to take the places of the "aristocrats" was one who was to dominate the history of Europe as no man before him had ever done. For fifteen years his biography and the political history of Europe are so nearly synonymous that the period we are now entering upon may properly be called after him, the Napoleonic Period.

Napoleon Bonaparte was hardly a Frenchman by birth. It is true that the island of Corsica where he was born, August 15, 1769, had at that time belonged to France for a year,[1] but Napoleon's native language was Italian, and he was descended from Italian ancestors who had come to the island in the sixteenth century. His father, Carlo Buonaparte, although he claimed to be of noble extraction, busied himself with the profession of the law in the town of Ajaccio where Napoleon was probably born. He was poor and found it hard to support his eight boys and girls, all of whom were one day to become kings and queens, or at worst, princes and princesses. Accordingly he took his two elder sons, Joseph and Napoleon, to France, where Joseph was to be educated for the priesthood and Napoleon, who was but ten years old, after learning a little French was to prepare for the army in the military academy at Brienne.

Napoleon Bonaparte (b. 1769), a Corsican by birth, an Italian by descent

Here the boy led an unhappy life for five or six years. He soon came to hate the young French nobles with whom he was associated. He wrote to his father, "I am tired of exposing my poverty and seeing these shameless boys laughing over it, for they are superior to me only in wealth and infinitely beneath me in noble sentiments." Gradually the ambition to free his little island country from French control developed in him.

Bonaparte at the military school (1779–1784)

On completing his course in the military school he was made second lieutenant. Poor and without influence, he had little hope of any considerable advance in the French army, and he was drawn to his own country both by a desire to play a political rôle there and to help his family, which had been left in straitened circumstances by his father's death. He therefore absented himself from his command as often and as long as he could, and engaged in a series of intrigues in Corsica in the hope of getting control of the forces of the island. He

His political intrigues in Corsica

The Bonapartes banished from Corsica (1793)

[1] It is possible that Bonaparte was born in the previous year, when Corsica still belonged to the republic of Genoa.

fell into disfavor, however, with the authorities, and he and his family were banished in 1793, and fled to France.

How Bonaparte won the confidence of Barras and the Directory

The following three years were for Bonaparte a period of great uncertainty. He had lost his love for Corsica and as yet had found no foothold in France. Soon after his return his knowledge of artillery enabled him, as we have seen, to suggest a successful method of capturing Toulon; and two years later his friend Barras selected him to defend the Convention against its enemies on the 13th Vendémiaire. This was the beginning of his career, for Barras, who had been chosen a member of the Directory, introduced him into the gay and reckless social circle to which he belonged. Here he met and fell in love with the charming widow of poor General Beauharnais, who had lost his head just before Thermidor. Madame Beauharnais accepted the pale, nervous little republican officer in spite of his awkward manners and ill-fitting uniform. Nine years later he was able to place an imperial crown upon her brow.

Napoleon marries Josephine Beauharnais

Bonaparte made commander in chief of the army of Italy (1796)

In the spring of 1796 Bonaparte was selected by the Directory to command one of the three armies which it was sending against Austria. This important appointment at the age of twenty-seven forms the opening of an astonishing military career which can be compared only with that of Alexander the Great.

How Prussia and Austria neglected the war with France in 1794

France, as has been pointed out, found herself in 1793 at war with Austria, Prussia, England, Holland, Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, Sardinia, the Kingdom of Naples (i.e. of the Two Sicilies), and Tuscany. This formidable alliance, however, only succeeded in taking a few border fortresses which the French easily regained. Prussia and Austria were far more interested in Poland, where a third and last partition was pending, than in fighting the Revolution and keeping the French out of the Austrian Netherlands. The Polish patriot, Kosciusko, had led a revolt of the Poles against their oppressors, and the Russian garrison which Catharine had placed in Warsaw was cut down by the Polish rebels in April, 1794. Catharine then

appealed to Frederick William for assistance. He therefore turned his whole attention to Poland,[1] and Pitt had to pay him handsomely to induce him to leave sixty thousand Prussian troops to protect the Netherlands from the French invaders. But England's money was wasted, for the Prussians refused to take active measures, and even Austria, after one or two reverses, decided to evacuate the Netherlands, in the summer of 1794, in order to center all her energies upon Polish affairs and prevent Russia and Prussia from excluding her, as they had done the last time, when it came to a division of the booty.

England unable to check the French, who occupy Holland and the Rhine region

England was naturally disgusted. She had joined the war in order to aid Austria and Prussia to maintain the balance of power and defend the Netherlands, which formed a protective barrier between Holland and France. Lord Malmesbury, one of the English diplomats, declared that in his dealings with the allies he encountered only "shabby art and cunning, ill will, jealousy and every sort of dirty passion." By October, 1794, the Austrians had disappeared beyond the Rhine; the English were forced to give up Holland and to retreat forlornly into Hanover before the French under General Pichegru, who captured the Dutch fleet imprisoned in the ice near Texel. The Dutch towns contained some enthusiastic republicans who received the French cordially. The office of hereditary stadholder,[2] which was really that of a king except in name, was abolished, and the United Netherlands became the Batavian Republic under French control.

The French republic concludes the Treaties of Basel with Prussia and Spain (April and July, 1795)

Instead of being crushed by the overwhelming forces of the allies, the armies of the French republic had, in the three years since the opening of the war, conquered the Spanish Netherlands, Savoy, and Nice; they had metamorphosed Holland into a friendly sister republic, and had occupied western Germany as far as the Rhine. The Convention was now ready to conclude its first treaties of peace. Prussia signed the Treaty of Basel with the new republic (April, 1795), in which she secretly

[1] See above, pp. 79–80.

[2] See above, p. 67.

agreed not to oppose the permanent acquisition by France of the left bank of the Rhine provided Prussia were indemnified for the territory which she would in that case lose. Three months later Spain also made peace with France. Early in 1796 the Directory decided, in accordance with General Bonaparte's advice, to undertake a triple movement upon Vienna, the capital of its chief remaining enemy. Jourdan was to take a northerly route along the river Main; Moreau was to lead an army through the Black Forest and down the Danube, while Bonaparte invaded Lombardy, which was, since the French had occupied the Netherlands, the nearest of the Austrian possessions.

Divisions of Italy

Italy was still in the same condition in which it had been left some fifty years before at the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, when the Austrian Hapsburgs and the Spanish Bourbons had come to a final agreement as to what each was to have for the younger members of the two families.[1] In the kingdom of Naples[2] the feeble Ferdinand IV[3] reigned with Caroline his wife, the sister of Marie Antoinette. To the north, stretching across the peninsula, lay the Papal States. Tuscany enjoyed the mild and enlightened rule of the successors of Joseph of Lorraine. Parma's duke was related to the Spanish house and Modena's to the Austrian, but the only part of Italy actually under foreign rule was Lombardy and its capital, Milan, which had fallen to Austria after the War of the Spanish Succession. The once flourishing republics of Venice and Genoa still existed, but had long since ceased to play a rôle in European affairs. The only vigorous and promising state in Italy that was not more or less under the influence of either Austria or Spain was the kingdom of Sardinia, composed of Piedmont, Savoy, Nice, and the island of Sardinia.

[1] See above, pp. 45–46.

[2] We shall use this name hereafter instead of the more cumbersome title, Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

[3] The successor of Don Carlos, who had become Charles III of Spain (see above, pp. 45 and 190).

Bonaparte forces Sardinia to conclude peace and enters Milan (May, 1796)

General Bonaparte had to face the combined forces of Austria and Sardinia, which had joined the enemies of France in 1793. By marching north from Savona he skillfully separated his two enemies. He forced the Sardinian troops back toward Turin and compelled the king to conclude a treaty by which Savoy and Nice were ceded to France. Bonaparte was now free to advance into Lombardy. He marched down the Po, and the Austrians, fearing that he might cut them off, hastened eastward, leaving Milan to be occupied by the French. Here Bonaparte made a triumphal entry on May 15, 1796, scarcely more than a month after the campaign opened.

The French begin to plunder Italy

As he descended the mountains into the plains of Lombardy, Bonaparte had announced that the French army came to break the chains of the tyrants, for the French people was the friend of all peoples. Nevertheless the Directory expected him to force those that he "freed" to support the French armies. Their directions to Bonaparte were sufficiently explicit: "Leave nothing in Italy which will be useful to us and which the political situation will permit you to remove." Accordingly Milan was not only required to pay its deliverers twenty million francs but also to give up some of the finest old masterpieces in its churches and galleries. The dukes of Parma and Modena made similar "contributions" on condition that Bonaparte would grant them an armistice.

The campaign about Mantua (May, 1796–February, 1797)

Bonaparte soon moved east and defeated the Austrian army, a part of which took refuge in the impregnable fortress of Mantua to which the French promptly laid siege. There is no more fascinating chapter in the history of warfare than the story of the audacious maneuvers by which Bonaparte successfully repulsed the Austrian armies sent to relieve Mantua. Toward the end of July an Austrian army nearly twice the size of Bonaparte's descended in three divisions from Tyrol. The situation of the French was critical, but Bonaparte managed to defeat each of the three divisions before they had an opportunity to join forces. In five days the Austrians retired, leaving

fifteen thousand prisoners in the hands of the French. Bonaparte now determined to advance up the river Adige into Germany. He again routed the Austrians and took possession of Trent. Wurmser, the Austrian commander, tried to cut him

Central Europe to illustrate Napoleon's Campaigns, 1796–1801

off from Italy but was himself shut up in Mantua with the remains of his army.

Bonaparte defeats the Austrians at Arcole (November 15–17, 1796) and at Rivoli (January 14–15, 1797)

In November two more armies were sent down to relieve Mantua, one approaching by the Adige and the other descending the Piave. Bonaparte met and defeated the Piave army in a three days' battle at Arcole, after which the other Austrian division retreated. The last effort to relieve the fortress was

frustrated by Bonaparte at Rivoli (January 14–15, 1797) and resulted in the surrender of Mantua, which gave the French complete control of northern Italy.

Fall of Mantua

All danger of an attack in the rear was now removed, and the victorious French general could lead his army through the mountains to Vienna. He forced back the Austrians, who attempted to block the road, and when, on April 7, he was within eighty miles of the capital, the Austrian commander requested a truce, which Bonaparte was not unwilling to grant, since he was now far from home, and both the other armies which the Directory had sent out, under Moreau and Jourdan, had been routed and forced back over the Rhine. A preliminary peace was accordingly arranged, which was followed by the definitive Treaty of Campo Formio (October, 1797).

Truce at Leoben (April, 1797)

The provisions of the Treaty of Campo Formio illustrate the unscrupulous manner in which Bonaparte and Austria disposed of the helpless lesser states. It inaugurated the bewilderingly rapid territorial redistribution of Europe which was so characteristic of the Napoleonic period. Austria ceded to France the Austrian Netherlands and secretly agreed to use its good offices to secure for France a great part of the left bank of the Rhine. Austria also recognized the Cisalpine Republic, which Bonaparte had created out of the smaller states of northern Italy, and which was under the "protection" of France. This new state included Lombardy, which Bonaparte had conquered, the duchy of Modena, some of the papal dominions, and, lastly, a part of the possessions of the venerable and renowned but now defenseless republic of Venice, which Napoleon had ruthlessly destroyed. Austria received as an indemnity for the Netherlands and Lombardy the rest of the possessions of the Venetian republic, including Venice itself.

Provisions of the Treaty of Campo Formio (October, 1797)

Creation of the Cisalpine Republic

While the negotiations were going on, the young general had established a brilliant court at a villa near Milan. "His salons," an observer informs us, "were filled with a throng of generals, officials, and purveyors, as well as the highest nobility and the

General Bonaparte establishes a court

most distinguished men of Italy, who came to solicit the favor of a glance or a moment's conversation." It would appear, from the report of a most extraordinary conversation which occurred at this time, that he had already conceived the rôle that he was to play later.

Bonaparte's analysis of the French character and of his own aims

"What I have done so far," he declared, "is nothing. I am but at the opening of the career that I am to run. Do you suppose that I have gained my victories in Italy in order to advance the lawyers of the Directory, — the Carnots and the Barras'? Do you think either that my object is to establish a republic? What a notion! . . . What the French want is Glory and the satisfaction of their vanity; as for Liberty, of that they have no conception. Look at the army! The victories that we have just gained have given the French soldier his true character. I am everything to him. Let the Directory attempt to deprive me of my command and they will see who is the master. The nation must have a head, a head who is rendered illustrious by glory and not by theories of government, fine phrases, or the talk of idealists, of which the French understand not a whit."

There is no doubt whom General Bonaparte had in mind when he spoke of the needed head of the French nation who should be "rendered illustrious by glory." This son of a poor Corsican lawyer, but yesterday a mere unlucky adventurer, had arranged his program; two years and a half later he was the master of the French republic.

Personal characteristics

We naturally ask what manner of person this was who could frame such audacious schemes at twenty-eight and realize them at thirty years of age. He was a little man, less than five feet two inches in height. At this time he was extremely thin, but his striking features, quick, searching eye, abrupt, animated gestures, and rapid speech, incorrect as it was, made a deep impression upon those who came in contact with him. He possessed in a supreme degree two qualities that are ordinarily considered incompatible. He was a dreamer and, at the same

time, a man whose practical skill and mastery of detail amounted to genius. He once told a friend that he was wont, when a poor lieutenant, to allow his imagination full play and fancy things just as he would have them. Then he would coolly consider the exact steps to be taken if he were to try to make his dream come true.

Sources of power in Napoleon's character

In order to explain Bonaparte's success it must be remembered that he was not hampered or held back by the fear of doing wrong. He was utterly unscrupulous, whether dealing with an individual or a nation, and appears to have been absolutely without any sense of moral responsibility. Neither did affection for his friends and relatives ever stand in the way of his personal aggrandizement. To these traits must be added unrivaled military genius and the power of intense and almost uninterrupted work.

The political conditions which rendered Napoleon's wonderful successes possible

But even Bonaparte, unexampled as were his abilities, could never have extended his power over all of western Europe, had it not been for the peculiar political weakness of most of the states with which he had to deal. There was no strong German Empire in his day, no united Italy, no Belgium whose neutrality was guaranteed — as it now is — by the other powers of Europe. The French republic was surrounded by petty, independent, or practically independent, principalities, which were defenseless against an unscrupulous invader. Prussia, much smaller than it now is, offered, as we shall see, no efficient opposition to the extension of French control, while Austria had been forced to capitulate, after a short campaign, by an enemy far from its source of supplies and led by a young and inexperienced general.

How Bonaparte made Himself Master of France

40. After arranging the Peace of Campo Formio, General Bonaparte returned to Paris. He at once perceived that

Bonaparte conceives the plan of an expedition to Egypt

France, in spite of her enthusiasm over his victories, was not yet ready to accept him as her ruler. The pear was not yet ripe, as he observed. He saw, too, that he would soon sacrifice his prestige if he lived quietly in Paris like an ordinary person. His active mind promptly conceived a plan which would forward his interests. France was still at war with England, its most persevering enemy during this period. Bonaparte convinced the Directory that England could best be ruined in the long run by occupying Egypt and so threatening her commerce in the Mediterranean, and perhaps ultimately her dominion in the East. Fascinated by the career of Alexander the Great, Bonaparte pictured himself riding to India on the back of an elephant and dispossessing England of her most precious colonial dependencies. He had, however, still another and a characteristic reason for undertaking the expedition. France was on the eve of a new war with the European powers. Bonaparte foresaw that, if he could withdraw with him some of France's best officers, the Directory might soon find itself so embarrassed that he could return as a national savior. And even so it fell out.

Accordingly General Bonaparte, under authority of the Directory, collected forty thousand of the best troops and fitted out a strong fleet, which should serve to give France the control of the Mediterranean. He did not forget to add to the expedition a hundred and twenty scientists and engineers, who were to study the country and prepare the way for French colonists to be sent out later.[1]

The campaign in Egypt (1798–1799)

The French fleet left Toulon, May 19, 1798. It was so fortunate as to escape the English squadron under Nelson, which sailed by it in the night. Bonaparte arrived at Alexandria, July 1, and easily defeated the Turkish troops in the famous

[1] One of the most noteworthy scientific results of Bonaparte's expedition to Egypt was the discovery of the Rosetta Stone, which the soldiers dug up at the mouth of the Nile. This has inscribed upon it a passage in Egyptian hieroglyphics accompanied by a Greek translation which furnished the modern world with the key to ancient hieroglyphic inscriptions. The stone is now in the British Museum.

battle of the Pyramids. Meanwhile Nelson, who did not know the destination of the enemy's fleet, had returned from the Syrian coast, where he had looked for the French in vain. He discovered Bonaparte's ships in the harbor of Alexandria and completely annihilated them in the first battle of the Nile

Nelson destroys the French fleet



Egyptian Campaign

(August 1, 1798). The French troops were now completely cut off from Europe.

The Porte (i.e. the Turkish government) having declared war against France, Bonaparte resolved to attack Turkey by land. He accordingly marched into Syria in the spring of 1799, but was repulsed at Acre, where the Turkish forces were aided by the English fleet. Pursued by pestilence, the army regained Cairo in June, after terrible suffering and loss. It was still strong enough to annihilate a Turkish army that landed at Alexandria; but news now reached Bonaparte from Europe

Syrian campaign

Bonaparte deserts the army in Egypt and returns to Paris

which convinced him that the time had come for him to hasten back. The powers had formed a new coalition against France. Northern Italy, which he had won, was lost; the allies were about to invade France itself, and the Directory was hopelessly demoralized. Bonaparte accordingly secretly deserted his army and managed, by a series of happy accidents, to reach France by October 9, 1799.

The *coup d'état* of the 18th Brumaire, November 9, 1799

The Directory, one of the most corrupt and inefficient governmental bodies that the world has ever seen, had completely disgraced itself and Bonaparte readily found others to join with him in a conspiracy to overthrow it. A plan was formed for abruptly destroying the old government and replacing it by a new one without observing any constitutional forms. This is a procedure so familiar in France during the past century that it is known even in English as a *coup d'état* (literally translated, a "stroke of state"). The conspirators had a good many friends in the two assemblies, especially among the "Elders." Nevertheless Bonaparte had to order his soldiers to invade the hall in which the Assembly of the Five Hundred was in session and scatter his opponents before he could accomplish his purpose. A chosen few were then reassembled under the presidency of Lucien Bonaparte, one of Napoleon's brothers, who was a member of the Assembly. They voted to put the government in the hands of three men, — General Bonaparte and two others, — to be called "Consuls." These were to proceed, with the aid of a commission and of the Elders, to draw up a new constitution.

Bonaparte made First Consul

The constitution of the Year VIII

The new constitution was a very cumbrous and elaborate one. It provided for no less than four assemblies, one to propose the laws, one to consider them, one to vote upon them, and one to decide on their constitutionality. But Bonaparte saw to it that as First Consul he himself had practically all the power in his own hands. The Council of State, to which he called talented men from all parties and over which he presided, was the most important of the governmental bodies.

The Council of State

The centralized administrative system established by Bonaparte

Bonaparte's chief aim was to *centralize* the government. Nothing was left to local assemblies, for he proposed to control everything from Paris. Accordingly, in each department he put an officer called a *prefect;* in each subdivision of the department a *subprefect.* These, together with the mayors and police commissioners of the towns, were all appointed by the First Consul. The prefects — "little First Consuls," as Bonaparte called them — resembled the former intendants, the king's officers under the old régime. Indeed, the new government suggested in several important respects that of Louis XIV. This administrative system which Bonaparte perfected has endured, with a few changes, down to the present day. It has rendered the French government very stable in spite of the startling changes in the constitution which have occurred. There is no surer proof of Napoleon's genius than that, with no previous experience, he could conceive a plan of government that should serve a great state like France through all its vicissitudes for a century.

The new government accepted by a plebiscite

The new ruler objected as decidedly as Louis XIV had done to the idea of being controlled by the people, who, he believed, knew nothing of public affairs. It was enough, he thought, if they were allowed to say whether they wished a certain form of government or not. He therefore introduced what he called a *plebiscite.*[1] The new constitution when completed was submitted to the nation at large, and all were allowed to vote "yes" or "no" on the expediency of its adoption. Over three million voted in favor of it and only fifteen hundred and sixty-two against it. This did not necessarily mean, however, that practically the whole nation wished to have General Bonaparte as its ruler. A great many may have preferred what seemed to them an objectionable form of government to the risk of rejecting it. Herein lies the injustice of the plebiscite; there are many questions that cannot be answered by a simple "yes" or "no."

[1] The *plebiscitum* of the Romans, from which the French derived their term *plébiscite*, was originally a law voted in the Assembly of the *plebs*, or people.

Bonaparte generally acceptable to France as First Consul

Yet the accession to power of the popular young general was undoubtedly grateful to the majority of citizens, who longed above all for a stable government. The Swedish envoy wrote, just after the *coup d'état:* "A legitimate monarch has perhaps never found a people more ready to do his bidding than Bonaparte, and it would be inexcusable if this talented general did not take advantage of this to introduce a better form of government upon a firmer basis. It is literally true that France will perform impossibilities in order to aid him in this. The people (with the exception of a despicable horde of anarchists) are so sick and weary of revolutionary horrors and folly that they believe that any change cannot fail to be for the better. . . . Even the royalists, whatever their views may be, are sincerely devoted to Bonaparte, for they attribute to him the intention of gradually restoring the old order of things. The indifferent element cling to him as the one most likely to give France peace. The enlightened republicans, although they tremble for their form of government, prefer to see a single man of talent possess himself of the power than a club of intriguers."

The Second Coalition against France

The Directory strikes at English commerce

41. Upon becoming First Consul, General Bonaparte found France at war with England, Russia, Austria, Turkey, and Naples, — a somewhat strange coalition which must be explained. After the treaties of Basel and Campo Formio, England had been left to fight the Revolution single-handed. The Directory issued a decree excluding her products from all lands under French control, especially cotton and woolen goods, hardware, pottery, and refined sugar, which were not to be imported on pain of confiscation. Although this was exactly the kind of law that England had been trying to enforce in her own interest for a century or so,[1] the English merchants were

[1] See above, pp. 117–118.

exasperated at the unprincipled French, and Pitt was encouraged to continue the struggle.

Russia enters the war as England's ally

He found an unexpected ally in the Tsar Paul.[1] Like his mother, Catharine II, whom he succeeded in 1796, he hated the Revolution; but, unlike her, he consented to send troops to fight against France, for which Pitt agreed (December, 1798) to help pay. Austria was willing to take up the war again since she saw no prospect of getting all the territory that Bonaparte had half promised her in the Treaty of Campo Formio. As for the Sultan, Bonaparte's Egyptian expedition brought the French to his very doors and led him to join his ancient enemy, Russia, in a common cause.

The Sultan

France republicanizes her neighbors

It certainly appeared to be high time to check the restless new republic which was busily engaged in spreading "liberty" in her own interest. Holland had first been *republicanized;* then Bonaparte had established the Cisalpine Republic in northern Italy; and the French had stirred up a revolution in Genoa, which led to the abolition of the old aristocratic government and the founding of a new Ligurian Republic which was to be the friend and ally of France.

The Roman Republic proclaimed (February, 1798)

Next, with the encouragement of Joseph Bonaparte, Napoleon's brother, who was the French ambassador in Rome, the few republicans in the Pope's capital proclaimed a republic. In the disturbance which ensued a French general was killed, a fact which gave the Directory an excuse for declaring war and occupying Rome. On February 15, 1798, the republicans assembled in the ancient forum and declared that the Roman Republic was once more restored. The brutal French commissioner insulted the Pope, snatched his staff and ring from his hand, and ordered him out of town. The French

[1] Paul was an ill-balanced person whose chief grievance against the French was that Bonaparte had captured the island of Malta on the way to Egypt. Malta had for centuries been held by the Order of the Knights of Malta, which had originated during the Crusades. Now the knights had chosen Paul as their "Protector," an honor which enchanted his simple soul and led him to dream of annexing Malta to his empire. Bonaparte's seizure of the island interfered with his plans and served to rouse a desire for vengeance.

seized the pictures and statues in the Vatican and sent them to Paris and managed to rob the new republic of some sixty million francs besides.

The Directory revolutionizes and plunders Switzerland (1798)

More scandalous still was the conduct of the Directory and its commissioners in dealing with Switzerland. In that little country, certain of the *cantons*, or provinces, had long been subject to others which possessed superior rights. A few persons in the canton of Vaud were readily induced by the French agitators to petition the Directory to free their canton from the overlordship of Berne. In January, 1798, a French army entered Switzerland and easily overpowered the troops of Berne and occupied the city (in March), where they seized the treasure — some four millions of dollars — which had been gradually brought together through a long period by the thrifty government of the confederation. A new Helvetic Republic, "one and indivisible," was proclaimed, in which all the cantons should be equal and all the old feudal customs and inequalities should be abolished. The mountaineers of the conservative cantons about the lake of Lucerne rose in vain against the intruders, who mercilessly massacred those who dared to oppose the changes which their "deliverers" chose to introduce. The money and supplies which the French appropriated were sent to Toulon to be used in the Egyptian expedition.

The Helvetic Republic

Naples reopens the war against France (November, 1798)

The new outbreak of war against France was due to Naples, where Marie Antoinette's sister, Caroline, watched with horror the occupation of Rome by the French troops. Nelson, after destroying Bonaparte's fleet in the battle of the Nile, had returned to Naples and there arranged a plan for driving the French from the Papal States. But everything went badly; the French easily defeated the Bourbon armies and the members of the royal family of Naples were glad to embark on the British ships and make their way to Palermo. Thereupon the French republicanized Naples, seized millions of francs as usual, and carried off to Paris the best works of art.

Naples turned into the Parthenopean Republic (January, 1799)

At the same time Piedmont was occupied by the French, and the king was forced to abdicate. He retired to Sardinia, where he remained until Napoleon's downfall fifteen years later.

Piedmont occupied by the French

Early in the year 1799 the French republic seemed everywhere victorious. It had at last reached its "natural boundaries" by adding to the Austrian Netherlands those portions of the Holy Roman Empire which lay on the left bank[1] of the Rhine, and, to the south, the duchy of Savoy. It had reorganized its neighbors, the Batavian Republic, the Helvetic Republic, the Ligurian Republic, the Cisalpine Republic, the Roman Republic, and the Parthenopean Republic, — all of which were to accept its counsel and aid it with money, troops, and supplies. Bonaparte had occupied Egypt and was on his way to Syria with gorgeous visions of subjugating the whole Orient.

France reaches its "natural boundaries" in 1799

Within a few months, however, the situation was completely changed. The Austrians defeated Jourdan at Stockach in southern Germany, and the French retreated to the Rhine. In Italy the brave Russian general, Suvaroff, with the small but valiant army which the Tsar had sent to the west, forced the French out of northern Italy and, with the aid of the Austrians, repeatedly defeated their armies and shut up the remains of their forces in Genoa, to which the Austrians laid siege. Suvaroff, after expelling the French from Piedmont, burned to push on into France. But the Austrian minister, Thugut, opposed the restoration of the king of Sardinia to his throne, and urged that Austria should be permitted to annex Piedmont since she alone would be powerful enough to keep the French out of Italy. Thereupon, utterly disgusted with his Austrian ally, Suvaroff turned northward through the Swiss mountains, across which he forced his way in spite of incredible difficulties, only to find that a second Russian army, which he had expected would join him, had been defeated by the French. Thereupon the Tsar, attributing the reverses of his armies to the

Suvaroff and the Austrians force the French out of Italy (April–August, 1799)

Russia withdraws from the war (October, 1799)

[1] That is to say, the bank which would lie to the left of one traveling down the river, in this case the west bank.

intrigues of the land-greedy Austria, broke off all relations with her and recalled his generals (October, 1799).[1]

The First Consul writes to George III and Francis II in the interests of peace

In November, 1799, the corrupt and inefficient Directory was, as we have seen, thrust aside by a victorious general to whom France now looked for peace and order. The First Consul sought to make a happy impression upon France by writing personal letters on Christmas Day to both George III and Emperor Francis II, in which he deplored a continuation of war among the most enlightened nations of Europe. Why should they "sacrifice to ideas of empty greatness the blessings of commerce, internal prosperity, and domestic happiness? Should they not recognize that peace was at once their first need and their chief glory?"

His advances not well received

The English returned a gruff reply in which Pitt declared that France had been entirely at fault and had precipitated war by her aggressions in Holland, Switzerland, and Egypt. England must continue the struggle until France offered pledges of peace, and the best security would be the recall of the Bourbon dynasty.[2] The Austrians also refused, though somewhat more graciously, to come to terms, and Bonaparte began secretly collecting troops which he could direct against the Austrian army that was besieging the French in Genoa.

Bonaparte crosses the St. Bernard Pass (May, 1800)

Bonaparte now proceeded to devise one of the boldest and most brilliant of campaigns. Instead of following one of the usual roads into Italy, either along the coast to Genoa or across the Alps of Savoy, he resolved to take the enemy in the rear. In order to do this he concentrated his forces in Switzerland and, emulating Hannibal, he led them over the difficult Alpine pass of the Great St. Bernard. There was no carriage road then as there is now, and the cannons had to be dragged over

[1] Naturally the republics which had been formed in Italy under French influence collapsed. Ferdinand returned to Naples and instituted a royalist reign of terror in which Nelson took part. His conduct met with hearty disapproval in England.

[2] This suggestion irritated the French and convinced them that England was their implacable enemy.

in trunks of trees which had been hollowed out for the purpose. Bonaparte arrived safely in Milan on June 2, 1800, to the utter astonishment of the Austrians, who had received no definite news of his line of approach. He immediately restored the Cisalpine Republic, wrote to Paris that he had delivered the Lombards from the "Austrian rod," and then moved westward to find and crush the enemy.

The battle of Marengo (June 14, 1800)

In his uncertainty as to the exact whereabouts of the Austrians, Bonaparte divided his forces when near the village of Marengo (June 14) and sent a contingent under Desaix southward to head off the enemy in that direction. In the meantime the whole Austrian army approached from Alessandria and the engagement began. The Austrians at first repulsed the French, and Bonaparte saw all his great plans in jeopardy as he vainly besought his soldiers to make another stand. The defeat was soon turned, however, into one of his most brilliant victories, for Desaix had heard the firing and returned with his division. Meanwhile the aged and infirm Austrian commander had returned to Alessandria, supposing that the battle was won. The result was that the French troops, reënforced, returned to the attack and carried all before them. The brave Desaix, who had really saved the day, was killed; Bonaparte simply said nothing of his own temporary defeat, and added one more to the list of his great military triumphs. A truce was signed next day, and the Austrians retreated behind the Mincio River, leaving Bonaparte to restore French influence in Lombardy. The districts that he had "freed" were obliged to support his army, and the reëstablished Cisalpine Republic was forced to pay a monthly tax of two million francs.

Moreau defeats the Austrian army in the forest of Hohenlinden (December, 1800)

While Bonaparte had been making his last preparations to cross the St. Bernard, a French army under Moreau, a very able commander, had invaded southern Germany and prevented the Austrian forces there from taking the road to Italy. Some months later, in the early winter, when the truce concluded after Marengo had expired, he was ordered to march on Vienna.

On December 3 he met the Austrian army in the snowy roads of the forest of Hohenlinden and overwhelmingly defeated it. This brought Austria to terms and she agreed to a treaty of peace at Lunéville, February, 1801.

Provisions of the Treaty of Lunéville (February, 1801)

In this, the arrangements made at Campo Formio were in general reaffirmed. France was to retain possession of the Austrian Netherlands and the left bank of the Rhine. The Batavian, Helvetic, Ligurian, and Cisalpine republics were to be recognized and included in the peace. Austria was to keep Venice.[1]

General peace of 1801

Austria's retirement from the war was the signal for a general peace. Even England, who had not laid down her arms since hostilities first opened in 1793, saw no advantage in continuing a struggle in which the continental powers refused longer to participate. After defeating the French army which Bonaparte had left in Egypt, she suspended hostilities and opened negotiations with France in the autumn of 1801, although the definite peace was not signed until the following March, at Amiens.

Two most important results of the treaties of 1801

Among many merely transitory results of these treaties, there were two provisions of momentous import. The first of these, Spain's cession of Louisiana to France in exchange for certain advantages in Italy, does not concern us here directly. But

(*a*) Bonaparte sells Louisiana to the United States (1803)

when war again broke out Bonaparte sold the district to the United States, and among the many transfers of territory that he made during his reign, none was more important than this. We must, however, treat with some detail the second of the great changes, which led to the complete reorganization of Germany and ultimately rendered possible the establishment of the present powerful German Empire.

(*b*) Effects of the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France

In the Treaty of Lunéville, the Emperor had agreed on his own part, as the ruler of Austria, and on the part of the Holy Roman Empire, that the French republic should thereafter possess in full sovereignty the territories of the Empire which lay on the left bank of the Rhine, and that thereafter the Rhine

[1] The text of this treaty may be found in the *Readings*, sect. 42.

should form the boundary of France from the point where it left the Helvetic Republic to the point where it entered the Batavian Republic. As an inevitable consequence of this cession, numerous rulers and towns — nearly a hundred in number — found themselves dispossessed wholly or in part of their lands. The territories involved included the Palatinate and the duchy of Jülich (both of which then belonged to Bavaria), the possessions of the archbishops of Treves and Cologne and of the bishop of Liége, the ancient free cities of Worms, Speyer, and Cologne, Prussia's duchy of Cleves, besides the tiny realms of dozens of counts and abbots.

Only the hereditary princes to be indemnified

The Empire bound itself by the treaty to furnish the *hereditary* princes who had been forced to give up their territories to France "an indemnity within the Empire." Those who did not belong to the class of hereditary rulers were of course the bishops and abbots and the free cities. The ecclesiastical princes were forbidden as clergymen to marry, and consequently could have no lawful heirs. Hence if they were deprived of their realms they might be adequately indemnified by a pension for life, with no fear of injustice to their heirs, since they could have none. As for the towns, once so prosperous and important, they now seemed scarcely worth considering to the more powerful rulers of Germany. Indeed it seemed absurd at the opening of the nineteenth century that a single town should be permitted to constitute an independent state with its own system of coinage and its particular customs lines.

The ecclesiastical states and the free towns to be used to indemnify the hereditary rulers

There was, however, no unoccupied land within the Empire with which to indemnify even the hereditary princes, like the elector of Bavaria, the margrave of Baden, the king of Prussia, or the Emperor himself, who had seen their possessions on the left bank of the Rhine divided up into French departments. It was understood by France, and by the princes concerned, that the ecclesiastical rulers and the free towns should pay the costs of this cession by sacrificing their territories on the right bank as well as on the left. The *secularization* of

the church lands, — as the process of transferring them to lay rulers was called, — and the annexation of the free towns implied a veritable revolution in the old Holy Roman Empire, as one may readily see who will turn back to the map given above (p. 22) and note the purple areas which represent the vast possessions of the ecclesiastical rulers.

The work of the imperial commission in reconstructing Germany

A commission of German princes was appointed to undertake the reconstruction of the map; and the final distribution was preceded by an undignified scramble among the hereditary rulers for bits of territory. All turned to Paris for favors, since it was really the First Consul and his minister, Talleyrand, who determined the distribution. Needy princelings are said to have caressed Talleyrand's poodle and played "drop the handkerchief" with his niece in the hope of adding a monastery or a shabby village to their share. At last the Imperial Commission, with France's help, finished its intricate task and the *Reichsdeputationshauptschluss*, as the outcome of their labors was officially called, was ratified by the diet in 1803.

Destruction of the ecclesiastical states and free towns

All the ecclesiastical states except Mayence were turned over to lay rulers, while of the forty-eight imperial cities only six were left. Three of these — Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck — still exist as members of the new German Empire. No map could make clear all the shiftings of territory which the Imperial Commission sanctioned. A few examples will serve to illustrate the complexity of their procedure and the strange microscopic divisions of the Empire.[1]

Examples of indemnification

Prussia received in return for Cleves and other small territories the bishoprics of Hildesheim and Paderborn, a part of the bishopric of Münster and of the lands of the elector of Mayence, the territories of the abbots, or abbesses, of Herford, Quedlinburg, Elten, Essen, Werden, and Kappenberg, and the free towns of Mühlhausen, Nordhausen, and Goslar, — over

[1] It has not been deemed feasible to give a map here to illustrate the innumerable changes effected by the *Reichsdeputationshauptschluss*. See map in Droysen, *Historischer Handatlas*, and the extraordinary maps at the end of Putzger's *Historischer Schul-Atlas*.

four times the area that she had lost. The elector of Bavaria, for more considerable sacrifices on the left bank, was rewarded with the bishoprics of Würzburg, Bamberg, Freising, Augsburg, and Passau, besides the lands of twelve abbots and of seventeen free towns; which materially extended his boundaries. Austria got the bishoprics of Brixen and Trent; the duke of Würtemberg and the margrave of Baden also rounded out and consolidated their dominions. A host of princes and counts received their little allotments of land or were assigned an income of a few thousand gulden to solace their woes,[1] but the more important rulers carried off the lion's share of the spoils. Bonaparte wished to add Parma as well as Piedmont to France, so the duke of Parma was given Tuscany, and the grand duke of Tuscany was indemnified with the archbishopric of Salzburg.[2]

Over two hundred independent states extinguished

These bewildering details are only given here to make clear the hopelessly minute subdivision of the old Holy Roman Empire and the importance of the partial amalgamation which took place in 1803. One hundred and twelve sovereign and independent states lying to the east of the Rhine were wiped out by being annexed to larger states, such as Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, Hesse, etc., while nearly a hundred more had disappeared when the left bank of the Rhine was converted into departments by the French.

Bonaparte's purpose to gain allies in southern Germany

Although Germany never sank to a lower degree of national degradation than at this period, this consolidation was nevertheless the beginning of her political regeneration. Bonaparte, it is true, hoped to weaken rather than to strengthen the Empire, for by increasing the territory and power of the

[1] For example, the prince of Bretzenheim, for the loss of the villages of Bretzenheim and Winzenheim, was given a "princely" nunnery on the lake of Constance; the poor princess of Isenburg, countess of Parkstein, who lost a part of the tiny Reipoltskirchen, received an annuity of twenty-three thousand gulden and a share in the tolls paid by boats on the Rhine, and so on.

[2] As for the knights, who were the least among the German rulers, those who had lost their few acres on the left bank were not indemnified, and those on the right bank were quietly deprived of their political rights within the next two or three years by the princes within whose territories they happened to lie.

southern states — Bavaria, Würtemberg, Hesse, and Baden — he expected to gain the permanent friendship of their rulers and so create a "third Germany" which he could play off against Austria and Prussia. He succeeded for a time in this design, but the consolidation of 1803 paved the way, as we shall see, for the creation sixty-seven years later of the present German Empire.

REFERENCES

Youth of Bonaparte: FOURNIER, *Napoleon*, chaps. i and ii, pp. 1–37; JOHNSTON, *Napoleon*, chap. i, pp. 1–13; ROSE, *The Life of Napoleon I*, Vol. I, chap. i, pp. 1–21.

The Beginning of Bonaparte's Military Career: JOHNSTON, chap. ii, pp. 14–26; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. xviii, pp. 560 *sqq.*; ROSE, Vol. I, chaps. ii and iii, pp. 22–69.

The First Italian Campaign: FOURNIER, chap. v, pp. 72–110; FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, chap. iii, pp. 74–103; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. xviii, pp. 553–593; JOHNSTON, pp. 27–44; ROSE, Vol. I, chaps. iv–vii, pp. 70–158.

The Egyptian Expedition: FOURNIER, chap. vi, pp. 111–153; JOHNSTON, pp. 44–58; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chap. xix, pp. 594–619; ROSE, Vol. I, chaps. viii and ix, pp. 159–197.

Overthrow of the Directory and Establishment of the Consulate: FOURNIER, chap. vii, pp. 154–187; FYFFE, chap. iv, pp. 104–144; JOHNSTON, pp. 59–78; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. i, pp. 1–33; ROSE, Vol. I, chap. x, pp. 198–220.

CHAPTER XV

EUROPE AND NAPOLEON

BONAPARTE RESTORES ORDER AND PROSPERITY IN FRANCE

General disorder in France under the Directory

42. Bonaparte was by no means merely a military genius; he was a distinguished statesman as well. He found France in a sad plight after ten years of rapid and radical change, incompetent government, and general disorder. The turmoil of the Reign of Terror had been followed by the mismanagement and corruption of the Directory. There had been no opportunity to perfect the elaborate and thoroughgoing reforms introduced by the first National Assembly, and the work of the Revolution remained but half done. Bonaparte's officials reported to him that the highways were infested with murderous bands of robbers, that the roads and bridges were dilapidated and the harbors filled with sand. The manufacturers and business men were discouraged and industry was demoralized.

The paper money

The financial situation was intolerable. The disorder had reached such a pitch that scarcely any taxes were paid in the year 1800. The *assignats* had so depreciated in March, 1796, that three hundred francs in paper were required to procure one in gold. Thereupon the Directory had withdrawn them at one thirtieth of their value and substituted another kind of paper money which rapidly declined in value in the same way that the *assignats* had done. The hard-beset government had issued all sorts of government securities which were at a hopeless discount, and had repudiated a considerable part of the public debt.

The First Consul and his able ministers began at once to devise measures to remedy the difficulties, and his officials,

Bonaparte's financial measures

scattered throughout France, saw to it that the new laws were enforced. The police was everywhere reorganized and the robbers brought to summary justice. The tax rate was fixed and the taxes regularly collected. A sinking fund was established designed gradually to extinguish the public debt; this served to raise the credit of the State. New government securities replaced the old ones, and a Bank of France was founded to stimulate business. The Directory had so grossly mismanaged the disposal of the lands of the clergy and emigrant nobles that they had brought in very little to the government. Bonaparte carefully cherished what remained unsold and made the most of it.

The Convention had separated Church and State (February, 1795), but the Directory continued to persecute the clergy

In no respect had the revolutionary governments been less successful than in dealing with the Church. We have seen how those priests who refused to swear to support the Civil Constitution of the Clergy had been persecuted. After Hébert's attempt to replace Christianity by the worship of Reason, and that of Robespierre to establish a new deistic worship of the Supreme Being, the Catholic churches began early in 1795 to be opened once more, and the Convention declared (February 21, 1795) that the government would no longer concern itself with religion; it would not in the future pay salaries to any clergyman, and every one should be free to worship in any way he pleased.[1] Thereupon both the "constitutional" and the non-juring clergy began actively to reorganize their churches. But while thousands of priests managed to perform their duties, the Convention, and later the Directory, continued

[1] This first law separating Church and State is interesting in view of the efforts which are now being made in France to effect the same result (see below, sect. 77). The Convention's decree read as follows: "No form of worship shall be interfered with. The Republic will subsidize none of them. It will furnish no buildings for religious exercises nor any dwellings for clergymen. The ceremonies of all religions are forbidden outside of the confines of the place chosen for their performance. The law recognizes no minister of religion and no one is to appear in public with costumes or ornaments used in religious ceremonies." The Convention gruffly added other limitations on religious freedom. It required, for example, that all services be conducted in a semi-private manner, with none of the old gorgeous display or public ceremonials and processions.

to persecute those who did not take a new oath to submit to the laws of the republic, and many suspected of hostility to the government were exiled or imprisoned.

Bonaparte hopes to gain the support of the Church

General Bonaparte, although himself a deist, nevertheless fully appreciated the importance of gaining the support of the Church and the Pope, and consequently, immediately upon becoming First Consul, he set to work to settle the religious difficulties. He freed the imprisoned priests upon their promising not to oppose the constitution, while those who had been exiled began to return in considerable numbers after the 18th Brumaire. Sunday, which had been abolished by the republican calendar, was once more generally observed, and all the revolutionary holidays, except July 14, the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, and September 22, the first day of the republican year, were done away with.

The Concordat of 1801

A formal treaty with the Pope, known as the *Concordat*, was concluded in September, 1801, which was destined to remain in force for over a hundred years. It declared that the Roman Catholic religion was that of the great majority of the French citizens and that its rites might be freely observed; that the Pope and the French government should arrange a new division of the country into bishoprics; that the bishops should be appointed by the First Consul and confirmed by the Pope, and the priests should be chosen by the bishops. Both bishops and priests were to receive a suitable remuneration from the government, but were to be required to swear to support the Constitution of the republic. The churches which had not been sold should be put at the disposition of the bishops, but the Pope agreed never to disturb in any way those who had acquired the former property of the clergy.

Bonaparte brings the Church under the control of the State

It is to be observed that Bonaparte showed no inclination to separate Church and State, but carefully brought the Church under the control of the State by vesting the appointment of the bishops in the head of the government, — the First Consul. The Pope's confirmation was likely to be a mere form. The

bishops were to choose no priests who were not agreeable to the government, nor was any papal bull or decree to be published in France without its permission.[1]

How the Revolution had changed the Church

In some ways the arrangements of the Concordat of 1801 resembled those which prevailed under the *ancien régime*, but the Revolution had swept away the whole mediæval substructure of the Church, its lands and feudal rights, the tithes, the monks and nuns with their irrevocable vows enforced by law, the Church courts, the monopoly of religion, and the right to persecute heretics, — all of these had disappeared and General Bonaparte saw no reason for restoring any of them.

The emigrant nobles permitted to return

As for the emigrant nobles, Bonaparte decreed that no more names should be added to the lists. The striking of names from the list, and the return of confiscated lands that had not already been sold, he made favors to be granted by himself. Parents and relatives of emigrants were no longer to be regarded as incapable of holding public offices. In April, 1802, a general amnesty was issued, and no less than forty thousand families returned to France.

Old habits resumed

There was a gradual reaction from some of the innovations of the Reign of Terror. The old titles of address, Monsieur and Madame, again came into use instead of the revolutionary "Citizen." Streets which had been rebaptized with republican names resumed their former ones. Old titles of nobility were revived, and something very like a royal court began to develop at the Palace of the Tuileries; for Bonaparte, in all but his title, was already a king, and his wife, Josephine, a queen.

The grateful reliance of the nation on Bonaparte

It had been clear for some years that the nation was weary of political agitation. How great a blessing, after the anarchy of the past, to put all responsibility upon one who showed himself capable of concluding a long war with unprecedented glory for France and of reëstablishing order and the security of

[1] In the "Organic articles" which, at the instigation of the First Consul, were passed by the Legislative Body, all the old Gallican liberties were reaffirmed and all the teachers in the theological seminaries were to subscribe to, and agree to inculcate, the Declaration of 1682 (see above, p. 146).

person and property, the necessary conditions for renewed prosperity! How natural that the French should welcome a despotism to which they had been accustomed for centuries, after suffering as they had under nominally republican institutions!

The *Code Napoléon*

One of the greatest and most permanent of Bonaparte's achievements still remains to be noted. The heterogeneous laws of the old régime had been much modified by the legislation of the successive assemblies. All this needed a final revision and Bonaparte appointed a commission to undertake this task. Their draft of the new code was discussed in the Council of State, and the First Consul had many suggestions to make. The resulting codification of the civil law — the *Code Napoléon* — is still used to-day, not only in France but also, with some modifications, in Rhenish Prussia, Bavaria, Baden, Holland, Belgium, Italy, and even in the state of Louisiana. The criminal and commercial law was also codified. These codes carried with them into foreign lands the principles of equality upon which they were based, and thus diffused the benefits of the Revolution beyond the borders of France.

General Bonaparte becomes Napoleon I, emperor of the French (1804)

Bonaparte had always shown the instincts of a despotic ruler, and France really ceased to be a republic except in name after the 18th Brumaire. The First Consul was able to bring about changes, one by one, in the constitution, which rendered his own power more and more absolute. In 1802 he was appointed Consul for life with the right to choose his successor. But this did not satisfy his insatiable ambition. He longed to be a monarch in name as well as in fact. He believed heartily in kingship and was not averse to its traditional splendor, its palaces, ermine robes, and gay courtiers. A royalist plot gave him an excuse for secretly urging that he be made emperor. France might, he argued, be replunged into civil war as long as there was any chance of overthrowing the government. The only safety for a great nation lay in hereditary power "which can alone assure a continuous political life which may endure

for generations, even for centuries."[1] The Senate was induced to ask him (May, 1804) to accept the title of Emperor of the French, which he was to hand down to his children or adopted heirs.[2]

A new royal court established in the Tuileries

December 2, 1804, General Bonaparte was crowned, in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, as Napoleon I, emperor of the French. The Pope consented to grace the occasion, but the new monarch seized the golden laurel chaplet before the Pope could take it up, and placed it on his own head, since he wished the world to understand that he owed the crown not to the head of the Church but to his own sagacity and military genius. A royal court was reëstablished in the Tuileries, and Ségur, an emigrant noble, and Madame de Campan — one of Marie Antoinette's ladies-in-waiting, who had been earning an honest livelihood by conducting a girls' school — were called in to show the new courtiers how to deport themselves according to the rules of etiquette which had prevailed before the red cap of liberty had come into fashion. A new nobility was established to take the place of that abolished by the first National Assembly in 1790: Bonaparte's uncle was made Grand Almoner; Talleyrand, Lord High Chamberlain; General Duroc, High Constable; and fourteen of the most important generals were exalted to the rank of Marshals of France. The stanch republicans, who had believed that the court pageantry of the *old régime* had gone to stay, were either disgusted or amused by these proceedings, according to their temperaments. But Emperor Napoleon would brook no strictures or sarcastic comment.

Napoleon's censorship of the press

From this time on he became increasingly tyrannical and hostile to criticism. At the very beginning of his administration he had suppressed a great part of the numerous political newspapers and forbidden the establishment of new ones. As

[1] See *Readings*, sect. 42, for Napoleon's report of recent events submitted at the close of the year 1804.

[2] Josephine had borne him no children.

emperor he showed himself still more exacting. His police furnished the news to the papers, and carefully omitted all that might offend their suspicious master. He ordered the journals to "put in quarantine all news that might be disadvantageous or disagreeable to France."[1] He would have liked to suppress all newspapers but one, which should be used for official purposes.

Napoleon destroys the Holy Roman Empire and reorganizes Germany

Napoleon on the necessity of war for France

43. A great majority of the French undoubtedly longed for peace, but Napoleon's position made war a personal necessity for him. No one saw this more clearly than he. "If," he said to his Council of State in the summer of 1802, "the European states intend ever to renew the war, the sooner it comes the better. Every day the remembrance of their defeats grows dimmer and at the same time the prestige of our victories pales. . . . France needs glorious deeds, and hence war. She must be the first among the states or she is lost. I shall put up with peace as long as our neighbors can maintain it, but I shall regard it as an advantage if they force me to take up my arms again before they rust. . . . In our position I shall look on each conclusion of peace as simply a short armistice, and I regard myself as destined during my term of office to fight almost without intermission."

Napoleon dreams of becoming emperor of Europe

On another occasion, in 1804, Napoleon said, "There will be no rest in Europe until it is under a single chief — an emperor who shall have kings for officers, who shall distribute kingdoms to his lieutenants, and shall make this one king of Italy, that one of Bavaria; this one ruler of Switzerland, that one governor of Holland, each having an office of honor in the imperial household." This was the ideal that he now found himself in a position to carry out with marvelous exactness.

[1] When the French fleet was annihilated by Nelson at Trafalgar in 1805, the event was not mentioned in the *Moniteur*, the official newspaper.

Reasons for England's persistent opposition to Napoleon

There were many reasons why the peace with England (concluded at Amiens in March, 1802) should be speedily broken, especially as the First Consul was not averse to a renewal of the war. The obvious intention of Napoleon to bring as much of Europe under his control as he could, and the imposition of high duties on English goods in those territories that he already controlled, filled commercial and industrial England with apprehension. The English people longed for peace, but peace appeared only to offer an opportunity to Napoleon to develop French commerce at their expense. This was the secret of England's pertinacity. All the other European powers concluded treaties with Napoleon at some time during his reign. England alone did not lay down her arms a second time until the emperor of the French was a prisoner.

War between France and England renewed in 1803. Napoleon institutes a coast blockade

War was renewed between England and France, May, 1803. Bonaparte promptly occupied Hanover, of which it will be remembered that the English king was elector, and declared the coast blockaded from Hanover to Otranto. Holland, Spain, and the Ligurian Republic — formerly the republic of Genoa — were, by hook or by crook, induced to agree to furnish each their contingent of men or money to the French army and to exclude English ships from their ports.

Napoleon threatens to invade England

To cap the climax, England was alarmed by the appearance of a French army at Boulogne, just across the Channel. A great number of flatboats were collected and troops trained to embark and disembark. Apparently Napoleon harbored the firm purpose of invading the British Isles. Yet the transportation of a large body of troops across the English Channel, trifling as is the distance, would have been very hazardous, and by many it was deemed downright impossible.[1] No one knows whether Napoleon really intended to make the trial. It is quite possible that his main purpose in collecting an army

[1] The waves and currents caused by winds and tides make the Channel very uncertain for all except steam navigation. Robert Fulton offered to put his newly invented steamboat at Napoleon's disposal, but his offer was declined.

at Boulogne was to have it in readiness for the continental war which he saw immediately ahead of him. He succeeded, at any rate, in terrifying England, who prepared to defend her coasts against the French invaders.

Alexander I joins England, April, 1805

The new Tsar, Alexander I,[1] had submitted a plan for the reconciliation of France and England in August, 1803; the rejection of this, the continued aggressions of Napoleon, and above all, his shocking execution of the duke of Enghien, a Bourbon prince whom he had arrested on the ground that he was plotting against the First Consul, roused the Tsar's indignation and led him to conclude an alliance with England, the objects of which were the expulsion of the French from Holland, Switzerland, Italy, and Hanover, and the settlement of European affairs upon a sound and permanent basis by a great international congress.

Austria joins the coalition of 1805, but Prussia remains neutral

Russia and England were immediately joined by Austria, who found Napoleon intent upon developing in northern Italy a strong power which would threaten her borders. He had been crowned king of Italy in May, 1805, and had annexed the Ligurian Republic to France. There were rumors, too, that he was planning to seize the Venetian territories which had been assigned to Austria at Campo Formio. The timid king of Prussia, Frederick William III, could not be induced to join the alliance, nor would he ally himself with Napoleon, although he was offered the electorate of Hanover, a very substantial inducement. He persisted in maintaining a neutrality which was to cost him dear.

Napoleon fails to get control of the sea and turns his attention to Austria

Napoleon had been endeavoring to get the advantage of the English on the sea, for there was no possibility of ferrying his armies across to England so long as English men-of-war were blockading the French squadrons and guarding the Channel. His efforts to free the French ships and concentrate them in the Channel proved vain, for Lord Cornwallis continued to

[1] Alexander had succeeded his father, Paul, when the latter was assassinated in a palace plot, March, 1801.

blockade one fleet in Brest while the other was forced to take refuge in the harbor of Cadiz where Lord Nelson watched it. These circumstances and the approach of the Austrian army through southern Germany led Napoleon to give up all thought of invading England and to turn his whole attention toward the east.

Napoleon captures Mack's army at Ulm (October 20, 1805) and then occupies Vienna

He misled Austria by massing troops about Strassburg and pretending that he was going to march through the Black Forest. Consequently, the Austrian general, Mack, concentrated his forces about Ulm in order to be ready for the French when they should appear. Napoleon was, however, really taking his armies around to the north through Mayence and Coblenz, so that he occupied Munich, October 14, and cut off the Austrians from Vienna in somewhat the same way that he had done when he crossed the St. Bernard Pass in 1800. He then moved westward, and six days later General Mack, finding himself surrounded and shut up in Ulm, was forced to capitulate, and Napoleon made prisoners of a whole Austrian army, sixty thousand strong, without losing more than a few hundred of his own men. The French could now safely march down the Danube to Vienna, which they reached, October 31.

Battle of Austerlitz (December 2, 1805)

Emperor Francis II had retired before the approaching enemy and was concentrating his troops north of Vienna in Moravia. Here he had been joined by the Russian army. The allies determined to risk a battle with the French and occupied a favorable position on a hill near the village of Austerlitz, which was to be made forever famous by the terrible winter battle which occurred there, December 2. The Russians having descended the hill to attack the weaker wing of Napoleon's army, the French occupied the heights which the Russians had deserted, and poured a deadly fire upon the enemy's rear. The allies were routed and thousands of their troops were drowned as they sought to escape across the thin ice of a little lake which lay at the foot of the hill. The Tsar withdrew the

remnants of his forces, while the Emperor in despair agreed to submit to a humiliating peace, the Treaty of Pressburg.

The Treaty of Pressburg (December 26, 1805)

By this treaty Austria recognized all Napoleon's changes in Italy, and ceded to his kingdom of Italy that portion of the Venetian territory which she had received at Campo Formio. Moreover, she ceded Tyrol to Bavaria, which was friendly to Napoleon, and other of her possessions to Würtemberg and Baden, also friends of the French emperor. As head of the Holy Roman Empire, Francis II also agreed that the rulers of Bavaria and Würtemberg should be raised to the rank of kings, and that they and the grand duke of Baden should enjoy "the plenitude of sovereignty" and all rights derived therefrom, precisely as did the rulers of Austria and Prussia.

Napoleon forms a new dependency, —the Confederation of the Rhine (1806)

These provisions of the Treaty of Pressburg are of vital importance in the history of Germany. By explicitly declaring several of the larger of the German states altogether independent of the Emperor, Napoleon prepared the way for the formation in Germany of another dependency which, like Holland and the kingdom of Italy, should support France in future wars. In the summer of 1806 Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, and thirteen lesser German states united into a league known as the Confederation of the Rhine. This union was to be under the "protection" of the French emperor and to furnish him with sixty-three thousand soldiers, who were to be organized by French officers and to be at his disposal when he needed them.

Napoleon refuses longer to recognize the existence of the Holy Roman Empire

On August 1 Napoleon announced to the diet of the Holy Roman Empire at Ratisbon that he had, "in the dearest interests of his people and of his neighbors," accepted the title of Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, and that he could therefore no longer recognize the existence of the Holy Roman Empire, which had long been merely a shadow of its former self. A considerable number of its members had become sovereign powers and its continuation could only be a source of dissension and confusion.

Francis II assumes the title of Emperor of Austria (1804)

The Emperor, Francis II, like his predecessors for several hundred years, was the ruler of the various Austrian dominions. He was officially known as King of Hungary, Bohemia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Galicia, and Laodomeria, Duke of Lorraine, Venice, Salzburg, etc., etc. When, however, the First Consul received as ruler of France the title of Emperor of the French, Francis determined to substitute for his long array of individual titles the brief and dignified formula, Hereditary Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary.

Francis abdicates as Emperor (August 6, 1806) and the Holy Roman Empire is dissolved

After the Treaty of Pressburg and the formation of the Confederation of the Rhine, he became convinced of the utter impossibility of longer fulfilling the duties of his office as head of the Holy Roman Empire and accordingly abdicated on August 6, 1806. In this way he formally put an end to a line of rulers who had, for well-nigh eighteen centuries, proudly maintained that they were the successors of Augustus Cæsar, the first Roman emperor. The slight bond that had held the practically independent German states together was now dissolved, and the way was left clear for a series of reconstructions which have resulted in the formation of a new and powerful German Empire with the king of Prussia at its head. But the story of this must be deferred.

Napoleon assigns Naples to Joseph Bonaparte and Holland to Louis

Napoleon went on steadily developing what he called "the real French Empire," namely, the dependent states under his control which lay outside the bounds of France itself. Immediately after the battle of Austerlitz, he had proclaimed that Ferdinand IV, the Bourbon king of Naples, had ceased to reign. He ordered one of his generals to proceed to southern Italy and "hurl from the throne that guilty woman," Queen Caroline, who had favored the English and entertained Lord Nelson. In March he appointed his elder brother, Joseph, king of Naples and Sicily, and a younger brother, Louis, king of Holland.

One of the most important of the continental states, it will have been noticed, had taken no part as yet in the opposition

to the extension of Napoleon's influence. Prussia, the first power to conclude peace with the new French republic in 1795, had since that time maintained a strict neutrality. Had it yielded to Tsar Alexander's persuasions and joined the coalition in 1805, it might have turned the tide at Austerlitz, or at any rate have encouraged further resistance to the conqueror. The hesitation of Frederick William III at that juncture proved a grave mistake, for Napoleon now forced him into war at a time when he could look for no efficient assistance from Russia or the other powers.

Prussia forced into war with France

The immediate cause of the declaration of war was the disposal of Hanover. This electorate Frederick William had consented to hold provisionally, pending its possible transfer to him should the English king give his assent. Prussia was anxious to get possession of Hanover because it lay just between her older possessions and the territory which she had gained in the redistribution of 1803.

Question of Hanover

Napoleon, as usual, did not fail either to see or to use his advantage. His conduct toward Prussia was most insolent. After setting her at enmity with England and promising that she should have Hanover, he unblushingly offered to restore the electorate to George III. His insults now began to arouse the national spirit in Prussia, and the reluctant Frederick William was forced by the party in favor of war, which included his beautiful queen, Louise, and the great statesman Stein, to break with Napoleon.

Napoleon's insolent behavior toward Prussia

The Prussian army was, however, as has been well said, "only that of Frederick the Great grown twenty years older"; one of Frederick's generals, the aged duke of Brunswick, who had issued the famous manifesto in 1792, was its leader. A double defeat near Jena (October 14, 1806) put Prussia entirely in the hands of her enemy. This one disaster produced complete demoralization throughout the country. Fortresses were surrendered without resistance and the king fled to the uttermost parts of his realm on the Russian boundary.

Decisive defeat of the Prussian army at Jena, 1806

The campaign in Poland (November–June, 1806–1807)

After crushing Prussia, Napoleon led his army into what had once been the kingdom of Poland. Here he spent a winter of great hardships and dangers in operations against the Russians and their feeble allies, the Prussians. He closed a difficult campaign far from France by the signal victory of Friedland (not far from Königsberg), and then arranged for an interview with the Tsar. The two rulers met on a raft in the river Niemen (June 25, 1807), and there privately arranged the provisions of the Treaty of Tilsit between France, Russia, and Prussia. The Tsar, Alexander I, was completely won over by Napoleon's skillful diplomacy. He shamefully deserted his helpless ally, Frederick William III of Prussia, and turned against England, whose subsidies he had been accepting.

Napoleon dismembers Prussia in order to create the grand duchy of Warsaw and the kingdom of Westphalia

Napoleon had no mercy upon Prussia, which he ruthlessly dismembered by depriving it of all its possessions west of the Elbe River, and all that it had gained in the second and third partitions of Poland. From the lands which he forced Frederick William to cede to him at Tilsit, Napoleon established two new French dependencies by forming the Polish territories into the grand duchy of Warsaw, of which his friend, the king of Saxony, was made ruler; and creating from the western territory (to which he later added Hanover) the kingdom of Westphalia for his brother Jerome.

Terms of the secret alliance of Tilsit between Napoleon and the Tsar

Russia, on the other hand, he treated with marked consideration, and proposed that he and the Tsar should form an alliance which would enable him to have his way in western Europe and Alexander in the east. The Tsar consented to the dismemberment of Prussia and agreed to recognize all the sweeping changes which Napoleon had made during previous years. He secretly promised, if George III refused to conclude peace, to join France against England, and to force Denmark and Portugal to exclude English ships from their ports. In this way England would be cut off from all of western Europe, since Napoleon would have the whole coast practically under his control. In return for these promises, Napoleon engaged

to aid the Tsar in seizing Finland from Sweden and annexing the so-called Danubian provinces, — Moldavia and Wallachia, — which belonged to the Sultan of Turkey.[1]

The Continental Blockade

Napoleon's plan of bringing England to terms by ruining her commerce

44. In arranging the Treaty of Tilsit, it is evident that Napoleon had constantly in mind his most persistent and inaccessible enemy, England. However marvelous his successes by land might be, he had no luck on the sea. He had beheld his Egyptian fleet sink under Nelson's attack in 1798. When he was making preparations to transport his army across the Channel in 1805, he was humiliated to discover that the English were keeping his main squadron penned up in the harbors of Brest and Cadiz. The day after he captured General Mack's whole army with such ease at Ulm, Nelson had annihilated off Cape Trafalgar the French squadron which had ventured out from Cadiz. After Tilsit, Napoleon set himself more earnestly than ever to bring England to terms by ruining her commerce and industry, since he had no hope of subduing her by arms. He proposed to make "that race of shopkeepers" cry for peace by absolutely cutting them off from trade with the continent of Europe and so drying up their sources of prosperity.

Napoleon's Berlin Decree (November 21, 1806)

In May, 1806, England had declared the coast from the mouth of the Elbe to Brest to be "blockaded," that is to say, she gave warning that her war vessels and privateers would capture any vessel that attempted to enter or leave any of the ports between these two points. After he had won the battle of Jena, Napoleon replied to this by his Berlin Decree (November, 1806) in which he proclaimed that England had "disregarded all ideas of justice and every high sentiment which civilization should bring to mankind"; that it was a monstrous abuse on her part to declare great stretches of coast in a state of blockade which her whole fleet would be

[1] They now form the kingdom of Roumania.

unable to enforce. Nevertheless he believed it a natural right to use the same measures against her that she employed against him. He therefore retaliated by declaring the British Isles in a state of blockade and forbidding all commerce with them. Letters or packages addressed to England or to an Englishman, or even written in the English language, were not to be permitted to pass through the mails in the countries he controlled. All trade in English goods was prohibited. Any British subject discovered in the countries occupied by French troops, or in the territories of Napoleon's allies, was to be regarded as a prisoner of war and his property as a lawful prize. This was, of course, only a "paper" blockade, since France and her allies could do little more than capture, now and then, some unfortunate vessel which was supposed to be coming from, or bound to, an English port.

England prepared to grant licenses to neutral ships. Napoleon's Milan Decree (December 7, 1807)

A year later England established a similar paper blockade of the ports of the French Empire and its allies, but hit upon the happy idea of permitting the ships of neutral powers to proceed, provided that they touched at an English port, secured a license from the English government, and paid a heavy export duty. Napoleon was ready with a still more outrageous measure. In a decree issued from "our royal palace at Milan" (December, 1807), he ordered that all vessels, of whatever nationality, which submitted to the humiliating regulations of England, should be regarded as lawful prizes by the French privateers.

Sad plight of the vessels of the United States

The ships of the United States were at this time the most numerous and important of the neutral vessels carrying on the world's trade, and a very hard time they had between the Scylla of the English orders and the Charybdis of Napoleon's Berlin and Milan decrees.[1] The Baltimore *Evening Post* in September, 1808, calculated that if an American ship bound for Holland with four hundred hogsheads of tobacco should decide to meet England's requirements and touch at London

[1] For the text of the Berlin and Milan decrees, see *Readings*, sect. 44.

on the way, its owners would pay one and a half pence per pound on the tobacco, and twelve shillings for each ton of the ship. With a hundred dollars for England's license to proceed on her way, and sundry other dues, the total would come to about thirteen thousand dollars. On the way home, if the neutral vessel wished to avoid the chance of capture by an English cruiser, she might pay, perhaps, sixteen thousand five hundred dollars more to England for the privilege of returning to Baltimore with a cargo of Holland gin. This would make the total contributions paid to Great Britain for a single voyage about thirty thousand dollars.

The United States tries to defend its shipping interests by an embargo

Alarmed and exasperated at the conduct of England and France, the Congress of the United States, at the suggestion of President Jefferson, passed an embargo act (December, 1807), which forbade all vessels to leave port. It was hoped that this would prevent the further loss of American ships and at the same time so interfere with the trade of England and France that they would make some concessions. But the only obvious result was the destruction of the previously flourishing commerce of the Atlantic coast towns, especially in New England. Early in 1809 Congress was induced to permit trade once more with the European nations, excepting France and England, whose vessels were still to be strictly excluded from all the ports of the United States.

Napoleon proposes to render Europe independent of colonial products

Napoleon expressed the utmost confidence in his plan of ruining England by cutting her off from the Continent. He was cheered to observe that a pound sterling was no longer worth twenty-five francs but only seventeen, and that the discouraged English merchants were beginning to urge Parliament to conclude peace. In order to cripple England permanently, he proposed to wean Europe from the use of those colonial products with which it had been supplied by English ships. He therefore encouraged the substitution of chicory for coffee, the cultivation of the sugar beet, and the discovery of new dyes to replace those — such as indigo and cochineal —

which came from the tropics. This "Continental System" caused a great deal of distress and discontent and contributed to his downfall, inasmuch as he had to resort to despotic measures to break up the old system of trade. Then he was led to make continual additions to his already unwieldy empire in order to get control of the whole coast line of western Europe, from the boundaries of Prussia around to those of the Turkish Empire.

Napoleon at the Zenith of His Power (1808–1812)

Napoleon's policy in France

45. France owed much to Napoleon, for he had restored order and guaranteed many of the beneficent achievements of the Revolution of 1789. His boundless ambition was, it is true, sapping her strength by forcing younger and younger men into his armies in order to build up the vast international federation which he planned. But his victories and the commanding position to which he had raised France could not but fill the nation with pride.

Public works

He sought to gain popular approval by great public improvements. He built magnificent roads along the Rhine and the Mediterranean and across the Alps, which still fill the traveler with admiration. He beautified Paris by opening up wide streets and quays and constructing bridges and triumphal arches that kept fresh in the people's minds the recollection of his victories. By these means he gradually converted a mediæval town into the most beautiful of modern capitals.

The "university" established by Napoleon in 1806

In order to be sure that the young people were brought up to venerate his name and support his government, Napoleon completely reorganized the schools and colleges of France. These he consolidated into a single "university"[1] which

[1] Only the theological seminaries and the polytechnic schools were excluded from the university. Napoleon's plan resembled the Board of Regents which constitutes the University of the State of New York.

comprised all the instruction from the most elementary to the most advanced. A "grand master" was put at its head, and a university council of thirty members drew up regulations for all the schools, prepared the text-books, and controlled the teachers, high and low, throughout France. The university had its own large endowment, and its instructors were to be suitably prepared in a normal school established for the purpose.

The *Imperial Catechism*

The government could at any time interfere if it disapproved of the teaching; the prefect was to visit the schools in his department and report on their condition to the minister of the interior. The first schoolbook to be drawn up was the *Imperial Catechism;* in this the children were taught to say: "Christians owe to the princes who govern them, and we in particular owe to Napoleon I, our emperor, love, respect, obedience, fidelity, military service, and the taxes levied for the preservation and defense of the empire and of his throne. We also owe him fervent prayers for his safety and for the spiritual and temporal prosperity of the State." [1]

The new nobility and the Legion of Honor

Napoleon not only created a new nobility but he endeavored to assure the support of distinguished individuals by making them members of the Legion of Honor which he founded. The "princes," whom he nominated, received an annual income of two hundred thousand francs. The ministers of state, senators, members of his Council of State, and the archbishops received the title of Count and a revenue of thirty thousand francs, and so on. The army was not forgotten, for Napoleon felt that to be his chief support. The incomes of his marshals were enormous, and brave actions among the soldiers were rewarded with the decoration of the Legion of Honor.

Napoleon's discontent with his achievements

Napoleon was, however, never content with his achievements or his glory. On the day of his coronation he complained to his minister, Decrès, that he had been born too late, that there was nothing great to be done any more. On his minister's

[1] See *Readings*, sect. 43, for further extracts from this extraordinary document.

remonstrating, he added: "I admit that my career has been brilliant and that I have made a good record. But what a difference is there if we compare ours with ancient times. Take Alexander the Great, for example. When he announced himself the son of Jupiter, the whole East, except his mother, Aristotle, and a few Athenian pedants, believed this to be true. But now, should I nowadays declare myself the son of the Eternal Father, there is n't a fishwife who would n't hiss me. No, the nations are too sophisticated, nothing great is any longer possible."

Napoleon's despotism in France

As time went on Napoleon's despotism grew more and more oppressive. No less than thirty-five hundred prisoners of state were arrested at his command, one because he hated Napoleon, another because in his letters he expressed sentiments adverse to the government. No grievance was too petty to attract the attention of the emperor's jealous eye. He ordered the title of *A History of Bonaparte* to be changed to *The History of the Campaigns of Napoleon the Great.* He forbade the performance of certain of Schiller's and Goethe's plays in German towns, as tending to arouse the patriotic discontent of the people with his rule.

Napoleon's European power threatened by the growth of national opposition to him

Up to this time Napoleon had had only the opposition of the several European courts to overcome in the extension of his power. The people of the various states which he had conquered showed an extraordinary indifference toward the political changes. It was clear, however, that as soon as the national spirit was once awakened, the highly artificial system created by the French emperor would collapse. His first serious reverse came from the people, and from an unexpected quarter.

A French army occupies Portugal (November, 1807)

After concluding the Treaty of Tilsit, Napoleon turned his attention to the Spanish peninsula. He was on friendly terms with the court of Spain, but little Portugal continued to admit English ships to her harbors. In October he ordered the Portuguese government to declare war on England and to confiscate

EMPEROR NAPOLEON I

all English property. Upon its refusal to obey the second part of the order, he commanded General Junot to invade Portugal and take charge of the government. Thereupon the royal family resolved to take refuge in their vast Brazilian empire, and when Junot reached Lisbon they were receiving the salutes of the English squadron as they moved down the Tagus on the way to their new home across the Atlantic. Easy and simple as was the subsequent occupation of Portugal, it proved one of Napoleon's serious mistakes.

Napoleon makes his brother Joseph king of Spain (1808)

Owing to quarrels and dissensions in the Spanish royal family, Spain also seemed to Napoleon an easy prey and he determined to add it to his subject kingdoms. In the spring of 1808 he induced both Charles IV of Spain and the crown prince Ferdinand to meet him at Bayonne. Here he was able to persuade or force both of them to surrender their rights to the throne,[1] and on June 6 he appointed his brother Joseph king of Spain. Murat, one of Napoleon's ablest generals, who had married his sister, succeeded Joseph on the throne of Naples.

Revolt in Spain against the foreign ruler (1808)

Joseph entered Madrid in July, armed with excellent intentions and a new constitution. The general rebellion in favor of the Crown Prince Ferdinand, which immediately broke out, had an element of religious enthusiasm in it; for the monks stirred up the people against Napoleon, on the ground that he was an enemy of the Pope and an oppressor of the Church. One French army was captured at Bailén, and another capitulated to the English forces which had landed in Portugal. Before the end of July Joseph and the French troops had been compelled to retreat behind the Ebro River.

[1] Charles IV resigned all his rights to the crown of Spain and the Indies "to the emperor of the French as the only person who, in the existing state of affairs, can reëstablish order." He and his disreputable queen retired to Rome, while Napoleon kept Ferdinand under guard in Talleyrand's country estate. Here this despicable prince lived for six years, occasionally writing a cringing letter to Napoleon. In 1814 he was restored to the Spanish throne as Ferdinand VII, and, as we shall see later, showed himself the consistent enemy of reform. See below, sect. 52.

Spain subdued by arms (December, 1808)

In November the French emperor himself led into Spain a magnificent army, two hundred thousand strong, in the best of condition and commanded by his ablest marshals. The Spanish troops, perhaps one hundred thousand in number, were ill clad and inadequately equipped; what was worse, they were overconfident in view of their late victory. They were, of course, defeated, and Madrid surrendered on December 4. Napoleon thereupon issued a proclamation to the Spanish people in which he said, "It depends upon you alone whether this moderate constitution that I offer you shall henceforth be your law. Should all my efforts prove vain, and should you refuse to justify my confidence, then nothing will remain for me but to treat you as a conquered province and find a new throne for my brother. In that case I shall myself assume the crown of Spain and teach the ill-disposed to respect that crown, for God has given me the power and the will to overcome all obstacles."

Napoleon begins radical reform in Spain

Decrees were immediately issued in which Napoleon abolished all vestiges of the feudal system, and declared that it should be free to every one who conformed to the laws to carry on any industry that he pleased. The tribunal of the Inquisition, for which Spain had been noted for hundreds of years,[1] was abolished and its property seized. The monasteries and convents were to be reduced to one third of their number, and no one, for the time being, was to be permitted to take any monastic vows. The customs lines which separated the Spanish provinces and hampered trade were obliterated and the customhouses transferred to the frontiers of the kingdom. These measures illustrate the way in which Napoleon spread the principles of the French Revolution by arms in those states which, in spite of their benevolent despots, still clung to their half-mediæval institutions.

The next month Napoleon was back in Paris, as he saw that he had another war with Austria on his hands. He left Joseph

[1] See above, p. 192.

insecure throne, and, in spite of the arrogant confi- his proclamation to the Spaniards, he was soon to hat they could maintain a guerilla warfare against which his best troops and most distinguished generals were powerless. His ultimate downfall was in no small measure due to the persistent hostility of the Spanish people.

Spain continues to require the presence of French troops

Austria was fearful, since Napoleon had gained Russia's friendship, that he might be tempted, should he succeed in putting down the stubborn resistance of the Spaniards, still further to increase his empire at her expense. She had been reorganizing and increasing her army, and decided that it was best to strike while some two hundred thousand of Napoleon's troops were busy in Spain. So the Austrian emperor's brother, the Archduke Charles, led his forces westward in April, 1809, and issued an appeal to the German nation in which he urged them to imitate the heroic Spaniards and rise against their oppressors. Although there was an ever-growing party in Prussia and southern Germany which longed to throw off Napoleon's yoke, the king of Prussia refused to join Austria unless Russia would lend her aid. The monarchs who composed the Confederation of the Rhine also clung to their "Protector," so Austria was left to meet "the enemy of Europe" single-handed.

Austria takes the field against Napoleon (April, 1809)

After defeating the Archduke Charles in Bavaria, Napoleon marched on to Vienna, but he did not succeed in crushing the Austrian forces as easily and promptly as he had done at Austerlitz in 1805. Indeed he was actually defeated at the battle of Aspern (May 21–22), but finally gained a rather doubtful victory in the fearful battle of Wagram, near Vienna (July 5–6). Austria was disheartened and again consented to conclude a peace quite as humiliating as that of Pressburg.

Battles of Aspern and Wagram (May and July, 1808)

She had announced that her object in going to war once more was the destruction of Napoleon's system of dependent states and had proposed "to restore to their rightful possessors all those lands belonging to them respectively before the Napoleonic usurpation." The battle of Wagram put an

The Treaty of Vienna (October, 1809)

end to these dreams and the emperor of Austria was forced to surrender to the victor and his friends extensive territories, together with four million Austrian subjects. A strip of land, including Salzburg, was given to the king of Bavaria; on the north, Galicia (which Austria had received in the first partition of Poland) was ceded to Napoleon's ally, the grand duke of Warsaw; and finally, along the Adriatic, Napoleon exacted a district which he added to his own empire under the name of the Illyrian Provinces. This last cession served to cut Austria entirely off from the sea.

Napoleon marries the Archduchess Maria Louisa (April, 1810)

The new Austrian minister, Metternich, was anxious to establish a permanent alliance with the seemingly invincible emperor of the French and did all he could to heal the breach between Austria and France by a royal marriage. Napoleon ardently desired an heir to whom he could transmit his vast dominions. As Josephine had borne him no children, he decided to divorce her, and, after considering and rejecting a Russian princess, he married (April, 1810) the Archduchess Maria Louisa, the daughter of the Austrian emperor and a grandniece of Marie Antoinette. In this way the former Corsican adventurer gained admission to one of the oldest and proudest of reigning families, the Hapsburgs. His second wife soon bore him a son, who was styled "King of Rome."

Napoleon "reunites" the Papal States to France (1809)

While Napoleon was in the midst of the war with Austria, he had issued a proclamation "reuniting" the Papal States to the French Empire. He argued that it was Charlemagne, emperor of the French, his august predecessor, who had given the lands to the Popes and that now, since the tranquillity and welfare of his people required that the territory be reunited to France, it was his obvious duty to deprive the Pope of his dominions.

Annexation of Holland and the Hanseatic towns (1810)

Holland, it will be remembered, had been formed into a kingdom under the rule of Napoleon's brother Louis. The brothers had never agreed,[1] and in 1810 Holland was annexed

[1] Louis Bonaparte, the father of Napoleon III, and the most conscientious of the Bonaparte family, had been so harassed by Napoleon that he had abdicated.

EUROPE
AT THE
TIME OF NAPOLEON'S
GREATEST POWER
ABOUT 1810
SCALE OF MILES
Empire of France
Dependencies
KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
ATLANTIC OCEAN
NORTH SEA
EMPIRE OF FRANCE
KINGDOM OF SPAIN
KM. OF PORTUGAL
KINGDOM OF SWEDEN
KINGDOM OF DENMARK
CONFEDERATION OF THE RHINE
EMPIRE OF AUSTRIA
KINGDOM OF ITALY
KM. OF NAPLES
EMPIRE OF RUSSIA
G. DUCHY OF WARSAW
TURKISH EMPIRE
BLACK SEA
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
ADRIATIC SEA
IONIAN ISLANDS
KINGDOM OF SICILY
Paris
Madrid
Rome
Naples
Palermo
Vienna
Berlin
Moscow
Constantinople
Lisbon
Gibraltar (English)
Algiers
Warsaw

to France, as well as the German territory to the north, including the great ports of Bremen, Hamburg, and Lübeck.

Napoleon had now reached the zenith of his power. All of western Europe, except England, was apparently under his control. France itself reached from the Baltic nearly to the Bay of Naples and included a considerable district beyond the Adriatic. The emperor of the French was also king of Italy and "protector" of the Confederation of the Rhine, which now included all of the German states except Austria and the remains of the kingdom of Prussia. Napoleon's brother Joseph was king of Spain, and his brother-in-law, Murat, king of Naples. Poland once more appeared on the map as the grand duchy of Warsaw, a faithful ally of its "restorer." The possessions of the emperor of Austria had so shrunk on the west that Hungary was now by far the most important part of Francis I's realms,[1] but he had the satisfaction of beholding in his grandson, the king of Rome, the heir to unprecedented power. Surely in the history of the world there is nothing comparable to the career of Napoleon Bonaparte! He was, as a sage Frenchman has said, "as great as a man can be without virtue."

Maximum extent of Napoleon's power

The Fall of Napoleon

46. But all Napoleon's military genius, his statesmanship, his tireless vigilance, and his absolute unscrupulousness could not invent means by which an empire such as he had built up could be held together permanently. Even if he could, by force or persuasion, have induced the monarchs to remain his vassals, he could not cope with the growing spirit of nationality among their subjects which made subordination to a French ruler seem a more and more shameful thing to Spaniards, Germans, and Italians alike. Moreover there were two governments that he had not succeeded in conquering, — England and Russia.

Insecurity of Napoleon's achievements

[1] Emperor Francis II of the Holy Roman Empire had become Francis I, emperor of Austria.

Wellington and the English in Spain (1808–1812)

The English, far from begging for peace on account of the continental blockade, had annihilated the French sea power and now began to attack Napoleon on land. Sir Arthur Wellesley (a commander who had made a reputation in India, and who is better known by his later title of the Duke of Wellington) had landed English troops in Portugal (August, 1808) and forced Junot and the French army to evacuate the country. While Napoleon was busy about Vienna in 1809 Wellesley had invaded Spain and gained a victory over the French there. He then retired again to Portugal where he spent the winter constructing a system of fortifications — the lines of Torres Vedras — on a rocky promontory near Lisbon. From here he could carry on his operations against the French with security and success. He and his Spanish allies continued to occupy the attention of about three hundred thousand of Napoleon's troops and some of his very best generals. So Napoleon never really conquered Spain, which proved a constant drain on his resources, a source of humiliation to him and of exultation and encouragement to his enemies.

The lines of Torres Vedras

Relations between Napoleon and Alexander I of Russia

Among the continental states Russia alone was entirely out of Napoleon's control. Up to this time the agreement of Tilsit had been maintained. There were, however, plenty of causes for misunderstanding between the ardent young Tsar, Alexander I, and Napoleon. Napoleon was secretly opposing, instead of aiding, Alexander's plans for adding the Danubian provinces to his possessions. Then the possibility of Napoleon's reëstablishing Poland as a national kingdom, which might threaten Russia's interests, was a constant source of apprehension to Alexander.

Russia could not afford to enforce the continental blockade

The chief difficulty lay, however, in Russia's unwillingness to enforce the continental blockade. The Tsar was willing, in accordance with the Treaty of Tilsit, to continue to close his harbors to English ships, but he refused to accede to Napoleon's demand that he shut out vessels sailing under a neutral flag. Russia had to dispose of her own products in some way

and to obtain English manufactures, as well as coffee, sugar, spices, and other tropical and semi-tropical products which she had no hope of producing herself. Her comfort and prosperity depended, therefore, upon the neutral vessels which visited her Baltic ports.

Napoleon determines to attack Russia (1812)

Napoleon viewed the open Russian ports as a fatal flaw in his continental system and began to make preparations for an attack upon his doubtful friend, who was already beginning to look like an enemy. In 1812 he believed that he was ready to subdue even distant Russia. His more far-sighted counselors vainly attempted to dissuade him by pointing out the fearful risks that he was taking. Deaf to their warnings, he collected on the Russian frontier a vast army of half a million men, composed to a great extent of young French recruits and the contingents furnished by his allies.

Napoleon's campaign in Russia (1812)

The story of the fearful Russian campaign which followed cannot be told here in detail. Napoleon had planned to take three years to conquer Russia, but he was forced on by the necessity of gaining at least one signal victory before he closed the first season's campaign. The Russians simply retreated and led him far within a hostile and devastated country before they offered battle at Borodino (September 7). Napoleon won the battle, but his army was reduced to something over one hundred thousand men when he entered Moscow a week later. The town had been set on fire by the Russians before his arrival; he found his position untenable, and had to retreat as winter came on. The cold, the lack of food, and the harassing attacks of the people along the route made that retreat the most signal military tragedy on record. Napoleon regained Poland early in December, accompanied by scarcely twenty thousand men of the five hundred thousand with whom he had opened the campaign less than six months before.[1]

[1] This does not mean that all but twenty thousand had been killed. Some of the contingents, that of Prussia for example, did not take an active part in the war. Some idea of the horrors of the Russian campaign may be obtained from the descriptions given in the *Readings*, sect. 46.

Napoleon collects a new army

He hastened back to Paris, where he freely misrepresented the true state of affairs, even declaring that the army was in good condition up to the time when he had turned it over to Murat in December. While the loss of men in the Russian campaign was enormous, just those few had naturally survived who would be most essential in the formation of a new army, namely the officers. With their help Napoleon soon had a force of no less than six hundred thousand men with which to return to the attack. This contained one hundred and fifty thousand conscripts who should not have been called into service until 1814, besides older men who had been hitherto exempted.

What Prussia had suffered from Napoleon

The first of his allies to desert Napoleon was Prussia, — and no wonder. She had felt his tyranny as no other country had. He had not only taken her lands; he had cajoled and insulted her; he had forced her to send her ablest minister, Stein, into exile because he had aroused the French emperor's dislike; he had opposed every measure of reform which might have served to strengthen the diminished kingdom which he had left to Frederick William III.

Reform of Prussia after the battle Jena

Prussia, notwithstanding the reforms of Frederick the Great, had retained its half-feudal institutions down to the decisive defeat of Jena. The agricultural classes were serfs bound to the soil and compelled to work a certain part of each week for their lords without remuneration. The population was still divided into three distinct castes, nobles, burghers, and peasants, who could not acquire one another's land. The disaster of Jena and the losses at Tilsit convinced the statesmen of Prussia — among whom Baron von Stein and Prince Hardenberg were conspicuous — that the country's only hope of recovery was a complete social and political revolution not unlike that which had taken place in France. They saw that the old system must be abolished, the peasants freed, and the restrictions which hedged about the different classes done away with, before it would be possible to arouse public spirit to a point where a great popular uprising might expel the intruder forever.

Abolition of serfdom in Prussia (October, 1807)

The first step toward this general reform was the royal decree of October 9, 1807,[1] intended to "remove every obstacle that has hitherto prevented the individual from attaining such a degree of prosperity as he is capable of reaching." Serfdom was abolished and the restrictions on landholding removed, so that any one, regardless of class, was at liberty to purchase and hold landed property of every kind.

Founding of the University of Berlin

Every thoughtful Prussian had been deeply shocked by the cowardly way in which the enemy had been permitted to occupy the whole country after a single defeat. Men like William von Humboldt and the philosopher, Fichte forwarded a moral and educational reform. The University of Berlin, now one of the foremost institutions of learning in the world, was founded, and four hundred and fifty-eight students matriculated during the first year (1810–1811). The *Gymnasien*, or high schools, were also greatly improved. A League of Virtue (*Tugendbund*), which was formed for the encouragement of morality and public spirit, did much to foster the growing love for the fatherland and the ever-increasing hatred of French domination.

The *Tugendbund*

The nationalizing of the Prussian army by Scharnhorst

The old army of Frederick the Great had been completely discredited, and a few days after the signature of the Treaty of Tilsit, a commission for military reorganization was appointed with a military genius, Scharnhorst, at its head. The main aim of Scharnhorst was to give every man a share in the work of defending his country. Napoleon permitted Prussia to maintain an army of no more than forty-two thousand men, but Scharnhorst arranged that this should constantly be recruited by new men, while those who had had some training in the ranks should retire and form a reserve. In this way, in spite of the small size of the regular army, there were as many as one hundred and fifty thousand men ready to fight when the opportunity should come. (This system was later adopted by

[1] This decree may be found in the *Readings*, sect. 46.

the other European states and is the basis of all the great armies of to-day.) Moreover the custom of permitting only nobles to be officers was abandoned, and foreign mercenaries were no longer to be employed.

Yorck deserts Napoleon

The Prussian contingent which Napoleon had ordered to support him in his campaign against Alexander was under the command of Yorck. It had held back and so was not involved in the destruction of the main army. On learning of Napoleon's retreat from Moscow, Yorck joined the Russians.

Prussia joins Russia against Napoleon (February, 1813)

This action of Yorck and the influence of public opinion finally induced the faint-hearted king, who was still apprehensive of Napoleon's vengeance, to sign a treaty with the Tsar (February 27, 1813), in which Russia agreed not to lay down arms until Prussia should be restored to a total area equal to that she had possessed before the fatal battle of Jena. It was understood that she should give up to the Tsar all that she had received in the second and third partitions of Poland and be indemnified by annexations in northern Germany. This proved a very important stipulation. On March 17 Frederick William issued a proclamation "To my People," in which he summoned his subjects — Brandenburgers, Prussians, Silesians, Pomeranians, and Lithuanians — to follow the example of the Spaniards and free their country from the rule of a faithless and insolent tyrant.

Napoleon's campaign in Saxony (1813)

Napoleon's situation was, however, by no means desperate so long as Italy, Austria, and the Confederation of the Rhine stood by him. With the new army which he had collected after his disastrous campaign in Russia the previous year, he marched to Leipzig, where he found the Russians and the Prussians under Blücher awaiting him. He once more defeated the allies at Lützen (May 2, 1813), and then moved on to Dresden, the capital of his faithful friend, the king of Saxony. During the summer he inflicted several defeats upon the allies, and on August 26–27 he won his last great victory, the battle of Dresden.

Austria and Sweden turn against Napoleon

Metternich's friendship had grown cold as Napoleon's position became more and more uncertain. He was willing to maintain the alliance between Austria and France if Napoleon would abandon a considerable portion of his conquests since 1806. As Napoleon refused to do this, Austria joined the allies in August. Meanwhile Sweden, which a year or two before had chosen one of Napoleon's marshals, Bernadotte, as its crown prince,[1] also joined the allies and sent an army into northern Germany.

Napoleon defeated in the battle of Leipzig (October, 1813).

Finding that the allied armies of Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Sweden, under excellent generals like Blücher and Bernadotte, had at last learned that it was necessary to coöperate if they hoped to crush their ever-alert enemy, and that they were preparing to cut him off from France, Napoleon retreated early in October to Leipzig. Here the tremendous "Battle of the Nations," as the Germans love to call it, raged for four days. No less than one hundred and twenty thousand men were killed or wounded and Napoleon was totally defeated (October 16–19).

The dissolution of Napoleon's empire

As the emperor of the French escaped across the Rhine with the remnants of his army, the whole fabric of his vast political edifice crumbled. The members of the Confederation of the Rhine renounced their protector and joined the allies. Jerome fled from his kingdom of Westphalia, and the Dutch drove the French officials out of Holland. Wellington had been steadily and successfully engaged in aiding the Spanish against their common enemy and by the end of 1813 Spain was practically cleared of the French intruders so that Wellington could press on across the Pyrenees into France.[2]

[1] See below, p. 350.

[2] The United States exasperated by England's interference with her commerce and her impressment of American seamen declared war against Great Britain in June, 1812. This exercised no appreciable effect upon the course of affairs in Europe. The Americans succeeded in capturing a surprising number of English ships and preventing the enemy from invading New England or taking New Orleans. On the other hand, the English succeeded in defending the Canadian boundary and took and destroyed Washington (August, 1814) just before the opening of the Congress of Vienna. Peace was concluded at Ghent before the end of the year, after about a year and a half of hostilities.

Occupation of Paris by the allies (March 31, 1814)

In spite of these disasters, Napoleon refused the propositions of peace made on condition that he would content himself henceforth with his dominion over France. The allies consequently marched into France, and the almost superhuman activity of the hard-pressed emperor could not prevent their occupation of Paris (March 31, 1814). Napoleon was forced to abdicate, and the allies, in seeming derision, granted him full sovereignty over the tiny island of Elba, off the coast of Tuscany, and permitted him to retain his imperial title. In reality he was a prisoner on his island kingdom, and the Bourbons reigned again in France.

Napoleon abdicates and is banished to the island of Elba

Return of Napoleon

Within a year, encouraged by the dissensions of the allies and the unpopularity of the Bourbons, he made his escape, landed in France (March 1, 1815), and was received with enthusiasm by a portion of the army. Yet France as a whole was indifferent, if not hostile, to his attempt to reëstablish his power. Certainly no one could place confidence in his talk of peace and liberty. Moreover, whatever disagreement there might be among the allies on other matters, there was perfect unanimity in their attitude toward "the enemy and destroyer of the world's peace." They solemnly proclaimed him an outlaw, and devoted him to public vengeance.

Battle of Waterloo, June, 1815

Upon learning that English troops under Wellington and a Prussian army under Blücher had arrived in the Netherlands, Napoleon decided to attack them with such troops as he could collect. In the first engagements he defeated and drove back the Prussians. Wellington then took his station south of Brussels, at Waterloo. Napoleon advanced against him (June 18, 1815) and might have defeated the English had they not been opportunely reënforced by Blücher's Prussians, who had recovered themselves. As it was, Napoleon lost the most memorable of modern battles. Yet even if he had not been defeated at Waterloo, he could not long have opposed the vast armies which were being concentrated to overthrow him.

Napoleon banished to St. Helena

The fugitive emperor hastened to the coast, but found it so carefully guarded by English ships that he decided to throw himself upon the generosity of the English nation. The British government treated him, however, as a dangerous prisoner of war rather than as a retired foreign general and statesman of distinction who desired, as he claimed, to finish his days in peaceful seclusion. He was banished with a few companions and guards to the remote island of Saint Helena.[1] Here he spent the six years until his death on May 5, 1821, brooding over his past glories and dictating his memoirs, in which he strove to justify his career and explain his motives.

The Napoleonic legend

"For the general history of Europe the captivity at St. Helena possesses a double interest. Not only did it invest the career of the fallen hero with an atmosphere of martyrdom and pathos, which gave it a new and distinct appeal, but it enabled him to arrange a pose before the mirror of history, to soften away all that had been ungracious and hard and violent, and to draw in firm and authoritative outline a picture of his splendid achievements and liberal designs. . . . The great captain, hero of adventures wondrous as the *Arabian Nights*, passes over the mysterious ocean to his lonely island and emerges transfigured as in some ennobling mirage."[2]

REFERENCES

Napoleon's Reforms in France: FOURNIER, *Napoleon*, chap. ix, pp. 221–241; JOHNSTON, *Napoleon*, chap. vii, pp. 88–102; ROSE, *Life of Napoleon I*, Vol. I, chap. xii, pp. 245–278; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chaps. v–vii, pp. 107–207.

[1] An isolated rocky island lying south of the equator between Brazil and the African coast, from which it is separated by some thirteen hundred miles of water.

[2] H. A. L. Fisher in the *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, p. 757. Some historians have accepted Napoleon at his own valuation, among them J. S. C. Abbott, whose popular but misleading life of Napoleon has given thousands of readers a wholly false notion of his character and aims.

Campaign of Austerlitz: FOURNIER, chap. xi, pp. 283–324; FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, chap. vi, pp. 179–207; JOHNSTON, chap. ix, pp. 119–129; ROSE, Vol. II, chap. xxii, pp. 1–46.

Napoleon's Creation of New States: FOURNIER, chap. xii, pp. 325–355.

The Continental System: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xiii, pp. 361–389.

Jena and Tilsit: FOURNIER, chap. xiii, pp. 356–390; FYFFE, chap. vii, pp. 208–246; JOHNSTON, pp. 130–147; ROSE, Vol. II, chaps. xxiv–xxvii, pp. 47–145.

Napoleon's Empire at its Height: FOURNIER, chap. xvi, pp. 493–535; FYFFE, chap. ix, pp. 271–306; ROSE, Vol. II, chap. xxxi, pp. 192–212.

Russian Campaign: FOURNIER, chap. xvii, pp. 536–579; FYFFE, chap. x, pp. 307–329; JOHNSTON, pp. 174–188; ROSE, Vol. II, chap. xxxii, pp. 213–245; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xvi, pp. 483–505.

German War of Liberation: FOURNIER, chap. xviii, pp. 580–642; FYFFE, chap. xi, pp. 330–367; JOHNSTON, chap. xiv, pp. 189–209; ROSE, Vol. II, chap. xxxv, pp. 303–366; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xvii, pp. 506–554.

Waterloo: FOURNIER, chap. xx, pp. 694–720; JOHNSTON, chap. xviii, pp. 223–238; ROSE, Vol. II, chap. xxxix, pp. 417–471; *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xx, pp. 616–645.

CHAPTER XVI

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE AT THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

The Congress of Vienna and its Work

Extreme difficulty of adjusting the map of Europe after the great changes of the Napoleonic Period

47. The readjustment of the map of Europe after Napoleon's downfall was an extremely perplexing and delicate operation. Geographical lines centuries old had been swept away by the storms of war and the ambition of the conqueror. Many ancient states had disappeared altogether, — Venice, Genoa, Piedmont, the Papal States, Holland, and scores of little German principalities. These had been either merged into France or the realms of their more fortunate neighbors, or formed into new countries, — the kingdom of Italy, the kingdom of Westphalia, the Confederation of the Rhine, the grand duchy of Warsaw. Those which had survived had, with the exception of England and Russia, received new bounds, new rulers, or new institutions. When Napoleon was forced to abdicate, the princes whose former patrimonies had vanished from the map, or who had been thrust aside, clamored to be restored to their thrones. The great powers, England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, whose rulers had been able with more or less success to resist the despoiler and had finally combined to bring about his overthrow, naturally assumed the rôle of arbiters in the settlement. But they were far from impartial judges, since each proposed to gain for itself the greatest possible advantages in the reapportionment of territory.

Some matters settled at the first Peace of Paris, May 30, 1814

The least troublesome points were settled by the allies in the first Treaty of Paris, which had been concluded in May, 1814, immediately after Napoleon had been sent to Elba. They readily agreed, for instance, that the Bourbon dynasty

should be restored to the throne of France in the person of Louis XVI's younger brother, the count of Provence, who took the title of Louis XVIII.[1] They at first permitted France to retain the boundaries she had had on November 1, 1792, but later deprived her of Savoy as a penalty for yielding to Napoleon after his return from Elba.[2] The powers also agreed, at Paris, upon a kingdom of the Netherlands with increased territories to be established under the House of Orange; the union of Germany into a confederation of sovereign states; the independence of Switzerland; and the restoration of the monarchical states of Italy. The graver issues and the details of the settlement were left to the consideration of the great congress which was to convene at Vienna in the autumn.

Chief rulers and diplomats present at Vienna

It was an imposing assembly that met in the Austrian capital in September, 1814. The kings of Prussia, Denmark, Bavaria, and Würtemberg, the Tsar, and the emperor of Austria were there in person, besides many minor princes, most of whom had come to reclaim their lost territories. Among the celebrated diplomats were Lord Castlereagh and, later, the duke of Wellington, representing England and her decrepit sovereign, George III, who had now almost lost his mind; the Prussian minister Stein, who had been driven from his country by Napoleon and was now chosen by Alexander I to advise him upon all matters in which Germany was concerned; William von Humboldt, the founder of the University of Berlin, and Hardenberg, the Prussian reformer and diplomat, stood by the side of Frederick William III; Prince Metternich, who for years was to be the chief adversary of further reform in Europe, was in charge of the interests of Austria.

[1] The young son of Louis XVI had been imprisoned by the Convention and, according to reports, maltreated by the jailers set to guard him. His fate has been a fruitful theme of historical discussion, but it is probable that he died in 1795. Though he never exercised power in any form, he takes his place in the line of French kings as Louis XVII.

[2] The second Peace of Paris (November, 1815), also provided for the return of the works of art and manuscripts which Napoleon had carried off from Venice, Milan, Rome, Naples, and elsewhere.

Singular career of Prince Talleyrand

Of all the plenipotentiaries none had a more delicate task than the representative of France, Talleyrand, whose strange career mirrored all the extraordinary changes of the previous quarter of a century. A bishop under the old régime, he had been elected to the Estates General and had advocated the fundamental reform of the Church. It was he who moved that its property be placed at the disposal of the State. He was chosen to perform mass at an altar on the Champ de Mars when France sent delegates to Paris to celebrate the first anniversary of the fall of the Bastille. He ordained bishops under the Civil Constitution of the Clergy in spite of the Pope's prohibitions, and when he was finally excommunicated he determined to devote himself frankly to political life. Attaching himself to the fortunes of the rising General Bonaparte, he became minister of foreign affairs during the Consulate, and under the empire was made grand chamberlain and prince of Benevento. He was active in the negotiations which led to the treaties of Lunéville, Amiens, Pressburg, and Tilsit. Alive to the recklessness of Napoleon's later policy, he made overtures during the Russian campaign to the count of Provence and was influential in placing him upon the throne of France. When Louis XVIII selected him to represent France at Vienna, Talleyrand, in spite of his years of experience in difficult negotiations, left Paris with the most gloomy misgivings.[1] He was able, however, to take advantage of the dissensions of the allies, and soon restored his country to an influential place in the councils of the powers.

The Congress of Vienna not in reality an organized deliberative body

Although the brilliant assembly at Vienna, which was lavishly entertained by the half-bankrupt emperor, is called a "congress," it was in reality merely a meeting of rulers and diplomats who came together, like the brokers on the stock exchange, each to make the best bargain he could with his fellows. The congress was never regularly opened, nor did it assemble as a deliberative body in which motions were

[1] See *Readings*, sect. 47.

submitted to be acted upon by the plenipotentiaries present. On the contrary, the disputes in regard to territory were settled by treaties concluded by the parties chiefly concerned. Indeed the four allied powers, England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, had come to some sort of an agreement before the congress opened and now proposed to submit their conclusions to the lesser powers for their assent.[1]

Impossibility of restoring the map of Europe to its condition before Napoleon's changes

The restoration of the map to its condition before Napoleon refashioned it was impossible, for Austria, Prussia, and Russia all had schemes for their own advantage which precluded so simple an arrangement. The congress was, in short, a scramble for territory on the part of the powers, who exhibited no more regard for ancient privileges and rights than Napoleon himself had shown. They tried to disguise their selfish schemes, but, as the secretary of the congress, Frederick von Gentz, said, "The grand phrases of 'reconstruction of social order,' 'regeneration of the political system of Europe,' 'a lasting peace founded on a just division of power,' and the like, were uttered to tranquillize the people and give an air of dignity and grandeur to this solemn assembly; — but the real purpose of the congress was to divide among the conquerors the spoils taken from the vanquished."

Holland made a kingdom, and given the former Austrian Netherlands

Some questions, however, the allies easily settled. They confirmed their former decision that Holland should become an hereditary kingdom under the House of Orange, which had so long played a conspicuous rôle in the nominal republic. In order that Holland might be better able to check any encroachments on the part of France, the Austrian Netherlands (which had been seized by the French Convention early in the revolutionary wars) were joined to the new Dutch kingdom. Metternich was entirely satisfied with this arrangement, for he

[1] The chief organ of the congress was a self-appointed "Committee of the Eight," composed of the representatives of Austria, Great Britain, Russia, and Prussia, who permitted the plenipotentiaries of the four other powers who had signed the Peace of Paris — viz. France, Spain, Sweden, and Portugal — to participate in their deliberations.

was relieved to have Austria removed from contact with the troublesome French. Moreover it fitted into the general plan of the congress to consolidate and strengthen, along the borders of France, the petty states whose weakness had for centuries invited French aggressions. The fact that most of the inhabitants of the Austrian Netherlands were not closely connected by language,[1] traditions, or religion with the Dutch had no weight in the councils of the powers, just as no such consideration had arisen in former times when the provinces had passed to Spain by inheritance and, later, to Austria by conquest. The Vienna Congress simply continued the old policy of carving out and distributing states among princes without regard to the wishes of the people concerned.

The consolidation of Germany leaves only thirty-eight surviving states

The territorial settlement of Germany did not prove to be so difficult as might have been expected. No one except the petty princes and the ecclesiastics desired to undo the work of 1803 and restore the old minute subdivisions which had been done away with by the *Reichsdeputationshauptschluss*. The restoration of the Holy Roman Empire could not be seriously considered by any one, but some sort of union between the surviving thirty-eight German states seemed to be expedient. They were accordingly united by a very loose bond, which permitted the former members of the Confederation of the Rhine to continue to enjoy that precious "sovereignty" which Napoleon had granted them. Formerly that portion of Germany which lies on the Rhine had been so broken up into little states that France was constantly tempted to take advantage of this disintegration to encroach upon German territory. After 1815 this source of weakness was partially remedied, for Prussia was assigned a large tract on the Rhine, while Bavaria, Baden, and Würtemberg stood by her side to discourage new aggressions from their dangerous enemy on the west.

Strengthening of Germany's western boundary

[1] About half the people of Belgium to-day speak French, while the remainder use Flemish, a dialect akin to Dutch, and a few speak German.

In the readjustment of Italy, Austria assigned a predominating influence

Italy was not so fortunate as Germany in securing greater unity than she had enjoyed before the French Revolution. Napoleon had reduced and consolidated her various divisions into the kingdom of Italy, of which he was the head, and the kingdom of Naples, which he had finally bestowed on Murat, while Piedmont, Genoa, Tuscany, and the Papal States he had annexed to France.[1] Naturally the powers had no reason for maintaining this arrangement and determined to restore all the former monarchical states. Tuscany, Modena, the Papal States, and Naples[2] were given back to their former princes, and little Parma was assigned to Napoleon's second wife, the Austrian princess, Maria Louisa. The king of Sardinia returned from his island and reëstablished himself in Turin. There were few at the congress to plead for a revival of the ancient republics of Genoa and Venice. The lands of the former were therefore added to those of the king of Sardinia, in order to make as firm a bulwark as possible against France. Austria deemed the territories of Venice a fair compensation for the loss of the Netherlands, and was accordingly permitted to add Venetia to her old duchy of Milan and thus form a new province in northern Italy, the so-called Lombardo-Venetian kingdom.

[1] Nothing need be said of a half dozen petty Italian territories, — Lucca, San Marino, Benevento, etc.

[2] Modena, as well as Tuscany, became a so-called secundo-geniture of Austria, for an Austrian archduke had married the daughter of the duke of Modena, who had been dethroned by Bonaparte in 1796. As for southern Italy, it will be remembered that in 1808, when Napoleon shifted his brother Joseph to the throne of Spain, he had made Murat king of Naples. Murat remained a faithful ally of Napoleon until the end of his rule; he distinguished himself in the Moscow campaign, and fought with valor at the battle of Leipzig. At last, however, to save himself and his throne, he entered into negotiations with England and Austria, and signed treaties with them in January, 1814. Louis XVIII and Talleyrand were bent on dethroning him and pressed the matter at Vienna. On Napoleon's return, in 1815, Murat, fearing that he could not maintain himself with the help of his new allies, and believing that the returning emperor would carry all before him, hastened northward with troops to aid him, only to be defeated by the Austrians and driven from Italy. Naturally the conquerors then restored Ferdinand to his ancient kingdom, and when Murat, in the autumn of 1815, made a last attempt to regain it, he was captured and shot.

Switzerland gave the allies but little trouble. Napoleon in 1803 had assumed the rôle of "mediator," and had given the Swiss a new form of government; he had readjusted the old boundaries of the cantons and instituted a federal diet in which each canton, or state, had its representatives. The Congress of Vienna recognized the cantons as all free and equal, and established their "neutrality" by agreeing never to invade Switzerland or send troops through her territory. The cantons (which had been joined by the former free city of Geneva) then drew up a new constitution, which bound them together into a federation consisting of twenty-two little states. **Switzerland**

Even the Scandinavian countries, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, were involved in the general settlement of 1815. At first Denmark and Norway, which for several centuries had constituted a single state, had kept out of the war, but when, in 1807, rumors reached England of Napoleon's secret treaty of Tilsit, in which he and the Tsar agreed to force Denmark into the continental system, the English squadron had bombarded Copenhagen, seized the Danish fleet, and carried it off to Portsmouth. This so angered Denmark that she concluded an alliance with Napoleon and remained his faithful ally down to his abdication. **Denmark**

Sweden had also for a time maintained neutrality, but Gustavus IV, who came to the throne in 1797, was a bitter opponent of revolution, and in 1805 he was so imprudent as to join England, Austria, and Russia in their coalition against Napoleon. It will be remembered that in the Treaty of Tilsit Napoleon had encouraged the Tsar to extend his territories by seizing Sweden's province of Finland. This Alexander had done in 1809, and at the same time the French occupied Swedish Pomerania[1] and added it to the Confederation of the Rhine. The impolitic conduct of Gustavus in joining in the war and the loss of the provinces led to his deposition. Since his uncle **Sweden and Bernadotte**

[1] A German district on the Baltic which had been awarded to Sweden at the close of the Thirty Years' War.

who succeeded him had no sons, the Swedes hit upon the singular notion of conciliating Napoleon by selecting one of his marshals, Bernadotte, as their crown prince and successor to the throne. After the Russian campaign Bernadotte joined the allies against Napoleon and signed a treaty with the Tsar confirming him in his occupation of Finland on condition that Sweden should be permitted to annex Norway if the war against Napoleon proved successful. He then turned his arms against Denmark and forced her to cede Norway to him.

Personal union of Sweden and Norway under the rule of the House of Bernadotte

The Congress of Vienna ratified these arrangements; Finland went to Russia, Norway to Sweden, and Swedish Pomerania was given to Prussia. The Norwegians protested, drew up a constitution of their own, and elected a king, but Bernadotte induced them to accept him as their ruler on condition that Norway should have its own separate constitution and government. This was the origin of the "personal union"[1] of Sweden and Norway under Bernadotte and his successors, which lasted until October, 1905.[2]

In these adjustments all was fairly harmonious, but when it came to the rewards claimed by Russia and Prussia there developed at the congress serious differences of opinion which

[1] This is the term applied in international law to describe the union of two or more independent states under a single ruler.

[2] This personal union worked very well so long as the joint king was tolerably free from control by the Swedish parliament, for the Norwegians had their own constitution and parliament, or Storthing, as it is called, and they could regard themselves as practically independent under a sovereign who also happened to be king of Sweden. However, especially during the past twenty years, the interests of the two countries diverged more and more widely. With the development of parliamentary government the diets of both countries desired to control the king's choice of ministers and the foreign policy of the two kingdoms. So, after a long period of friction, the two states mutually agreed to separate on October 26, 1905. Sweden retained her old king, Oscar II (1872–1907), while Norway elected as king Prince Carl, second son of Frederick, king of Denmark, and gave him the title of Haakon VII. The Norwegians still retain the constitution which was drawn up in 1814, but it has been several times modified by democratic measures. The parliament is chosen by all adult males twenty-five years of age, and when it meets it divides itself into an upper and lower house. Lutheranism is the state religion of Norway and Sweden. See Seignobos, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 554–566, and the *Statesman's Year-Book* (1907), pp. 1270–1288, 1483–1501.

nearly brought on war between the allies themselves, and which encouraged Napoleon's return from Elba. Russia desired the grand duchy of Warsaw, which Napoleon had formed principally out of the territory seized by Austria and Prussia in the partitions of the previous century. The Tsar proposed to increase this duchy by the addition of a portion of Russian Poland and so form a kingdom to be united in a personal union with his other dominions. The king of Prussia agreed to this plan on condition that he should be indemnified for the loss of a large portion of his former Polish territories by the annexation of the lands of the king of Saxony, who, it was argued, merited this retribution for remaining faithful to Napoleon after the other members of the Confederation of the Rhine had deserted him.

Russia and Prussia agree upon the fate of the grand duchy of Warsaw and of the kingdom of Saxony

Austria and England, on the other hand, were opposed to this arrangement. They did not approve of dispossessing the king of Saxony or of extending the Tsar's influence westward by giving him Poland; and Austria had special grounds for objection because a large portion of the duchy of Warsaw which the Tsar proposed to take had formerly belonged to her. The great diplomatist, Talleyrand, now saw his chance to disturb the good will existing between England, Prussia, Austria, and Russia. The allies had resolved to treat France as a black sheep and arrange everything to suit themselves. But now that they were hopelessly at odds Austria and England found the hitherto discredited France a welcome ally. Acting with the consent of Louis XVIII, Talleyrand offered to Austria the aid of French arms in resisting the proposal of Russia and Prussia, and on January 3, 1815, France, England, and Austria joined in a secret treaty against Russia and Prussia, and even went so far as to draw up a plan of campaign. So France, the disturber of the peace of Europe for the last quarter of a century, was received back into the family of nations, and the French ambassador joyfully announced to his king that the coalition against France was dissolved forever.

England, Austria, and France prepare to oppose the plans of Russia and Prussia

Skillful diplomacy of Talleyrand

The Tsar gets Poland, and Prussia becomes powerful on the Rhine

A compromise was, however, at length arranged without resorting to arms. The Tsar gave up a small portion of the duchy of Warsaw, but was allowed to create the kingdom of Poland on which he had set his heart. Only about one half of the possessions of the king of Saxony were ceded to Prussia, but as a further indemnity Prussia received certain districts on the left bank of the Rhine, which had belonged to petty lay and ecclesiastical princes before the Peace of Lunéville. This proved an important gain for Prussia, although it was not considered so at the time. It gave her a large number of German subjects in exchange for the Poles she lost, and so prepared the way for her to become the dominant power in Germany.

Map of Europe in 1815 as compared with the conditions established by the Treaty of Utrecht

If one compares the map of Europe as it was reconstructed by the plenipotentiaries of the great powers at Vienna with the situation after the Treaty of Utrecht a hundred years before, several very important changes are apparent. A general consolidation had been effected. Holland and the Austrian Netherlands were united under one king. The Holy Roman Empire, with its hundreds of petty principalities, had disappeared and a union of thirty-eight states and free towns had taken its place. Prussia had greatly increased the extent of its German territories, although these remained rather scattered. The kingdom of Poland still appeared on the map, but had lost its independence and been reduced in extent. Portions of it had fallen to Prussia and Austria, but the great mass of Polish territory was now brought under the control of the Tsar, who was no longer regarded by the western nations as an eastern potentate but was regularly admitted to their councils. Austria had lost her outlying provinces of the Netherlands, which had proved so troublesome, but had been indemnified by the lands of the extinct Venetian republic, while her future rival in Italy, the king of Sardinia, had been strengthened by receiving the important city of Genoa and the adjacent territory. Otherwise, Italy remained in her former state of disruption and more completely than ever under the control of Austria.

EUROPE
After 1815
KINGDOM OF DENMARK
COPENHAGEN
BALTIC SEA
PRUSSIA
RUSSIA
POLAND
Warsaw
Amsterdam & Rotterdam
KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS
Brussels
Antwerp
GERMAN CONFEDERATION
BERLIN
Frankfort
Prague
BOHEMIA
GALICIA
VOLHYNIA
PODOLIA
PARIS
KINGDOM OF FRANCE
Stuttgart
VIENNA
Pressburg
Buda Pesth
AUSTRIAN EMPIRE
HUNGARY
TRANSYLVANIA
SWITZERLAND
TYROL
Trieste
Venice
Milan
Turin
Genoa
Nice
Marseilles
Leghorn
DUCHY OF TUSCANY
ROME
KINGDOM OF NAPLES
KINGDOM OF SPAIN
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
ADRIATIC SEA
SLAVONIA
BOSNIA
SERVIA
Belgrade
Bucharest
WALLACHIA
MOLDAVIA
OTTOMAN EMPIRE
Adrianople
CONSTANTINOPLE
BLACK SEA
Longitude East from Greenwich

England gains Ceylon and the Cape of Good Hope

The gains of England resulting from the Napoleonic conflict, like all her other acquisitions since the War of the Spanish Succession, were colonial. The most important of these were Ceylon, off the southeastern coast of the Indian peninsula, and the Cape of Good Hope, which had been wrested from the Dutch (1806) while they were under Napoleon's influence. The latter territory, which had been settled by the Dutch as a halfway post for their ships bound to India and the Spice Islands, had a population of about sixty thousand, two thirds of whom were slaves, and the rest Dutch "Boers," or farmers, with a few French Huguenots, who, fleeing from the wrath of Louis XIV, had found homes in these wilds. Only a small area was then occupied and all the country northward now comprised in the Orange River Colony, Transvaal, and Natal regions was an unexplored wilderness. This seemingly insignificant conquest proved, however, to be the basis of the British expansion which has secured the most valuable portions of southern Africa.[1]

Vast extent of England's colonial possessions in 1815

In spite of the loss of the American colonies on the eve of the French Revolution, England possessed in 1815 the foundations of the greatest commercial and colonial power which has ever existed. She still held Canada and all the vast northwest of the North American continent, except Alaska. Important islands in the West Indies furnished stations from which a lucrative trade with South America could be carried on. In Gibraltar she had a sentinel at the gateway of the Mediterranean, and the possession of the Cape of Good Hope not only afforded a basis for pressing into the heart of the most habitable part of Africa, but also a halfway port for

[1] England also received from France the island of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean, east of Madagascar; Tobago, a small island north of the mouth of the Orinoco river, and Saint Lucia, one of the Windward Islands. From Spain England got the island of Trinidad near Tobago, and from Denmark the island of Heligoland, commanding the mouth of the Elbe (recently ceded to Germany). In the Mediterranean England held Malta and, as a protectorate, the Ionian Islands off the coast of Greece, thus securing a basis for operations in the eastern Mediterranean.

vessels bound to distant India. In India the beginnings of empire had already been made in the Bengal region and along the east and west coasts. Finally, in Australia, far away in the southern Pacific, penal settlements had been made which were in time to be supplanted by rich, populous, and prosperous commonwealths. In addition to her colonial strength England possessed the most formidable navy and the largest mercantile marine afloat.

The Congress of Vienna, under the

The Congress of Vienna marks the disappearance of one of the most atrocious practices which Europe had inherited from

followed England's example in 1813, and Holland a year later. Napoleon, on his return from Elba, in order to gain if possible the confidence of England, abolished the French slave trade.

Disregard of nationality before the nineteenth century

Napoleon had done more than alter the map of Europe and introduce such reforms in the countries under his control as suited his purposes; he had aroused the modern spirit of nationality, which is one of the forces that helped to make the nineteenth century different from the eighteenth. Before the French Revolution kings went to war without consulting their subjects, and made arrangements with other monarchs in regard to the distribution, division, and annexation of territory without asking the consent of those who lived in the regions involved. Practically no attention was paid to differences in race, for kings gladly added to their realms any lands they could gain by conquest, negotiation, marriage, or inheritance regardless of the particular kind of subjects that they might bring under their scepters. Louis XIV tried to annex the Austrian Netherlands to France, although a great part of the people spoke Flemish; and he claimed the Palatinate where German was spoken. Frederick the Great was willing to have Poles among his subjects as well as Silesians, and Austria added Italian Lombardy on the south and Polish Galicia on the north. There was indeed no reason why the people should be consulted, for the government was vested in the kings, who were responsible not to them but to God alone. When the people of Tuscany woke up to find themselves under a duke of Lorraine instead of the House of Medici, they had no more right to complain than a herd of cattle which is sold to a new owner.

The French National Assembly declares the monarch responsible to the nation, and so awakens political life among the people

Bishop Bossuet's notions of the divine right of kings, which he based on the Bible's account of the Hebrew rulers, were still in 1815 good enough for Prince Metternich and for many among the nobility and clergy, but the French Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789 had proclaimed, "under the auspices of the Supreme Being," that the law was the expression

of the general will and that every citizen had a right, personally or through his representatives, to participate in its formation. The king and his officials were made responsible for their public acts not to God but to the people. This idea that the nation had a right to control the making of the laws and the granting of the taxes, and to choose or depose its ruler, who was responsible to it, served to rouse a general interest in political questions, which could not possibly have developed so long as people were content to believe that God had excluded them from all participation in affairs of State. Political leaders appeared, the newspapers began to discuss public questions, and political societies were formed.

The French revolutionists did not emphasize national differences

The leaders of the French Revolution had not, however, been much interested in nationality. They believed that they had discovered a system of government, based upon the eternal rights of man, which was suited by nature to all peoples. The French Convention had promised to aid any nation which wished to free itself from the tyranny of a despot. They showed no inclination, however, to distinguish very carefully between Frenchmen, Dutchmen, Germans, Swiss, or Italians.

How Napoleon's conduct aroused the national spirit

Napoleon was also indifferent to nationality and his arbitrary policy in setting up and pulling down monarchies, and in remodeling the states of Europe to suit his fancy, was only a new, bewildering illustration of the arrogant habits of Louis XIV, Frederick the Great, and Catharine; but the opposition that it called forth, first in Spain and then in Prussia, indicated that the rulers in the nineteenth century would be compelled to consider the sentiments of the people they ruled as well as their own individual interests. The various nations became more and more keenly conscious that each had its own language and traditions which made it different from other peoples. Patriotic orators in Germany, Italy, and Greece recalled the glorious past of the ancient Germans, Romans, and Hellenes, with a view of stimulating this enthusiasm. National feeling may be defined as a general recognition that a people

should have a government suited to its particular traditions and needs, and should be ruled by its own native officials, and that (if nations were entitled to political rights, as the French Revolution had taught) it was wrong that one people should be dominated by another, or that monarchs should divide up, redistribute, and transfer territories with no regard to the wishes of the inhabitants, merely to provide some landless prince with a patrimony.

The mixture of races precludes the complete realization of the demands of the national spirit

We shall have to reckon hereafter with this national spirit which continued to spread and to increase in strength during the nineteenth century. It has played a great part in the unification of Italy and Germany, in the emancipation of Greece and the Balkan states from Turkish dominion, and in the problems which have faced Austria, with its heterogeneous population. Its demands, however, can scarcely ever be completely realized, since the mixture of people is so considerable that each can hardly expect to have its own territory all to itself and its own independent government. There are still Italians outside of Italy, Germans outside of Germany, Bulgarians outside of Bulgaria; and the laws of Switzerland have to be drawn up in no less than three languages to make them intelligible to the different races which inhabit that limited territory.

The Holy Alliance: Metternich becomes the Chief Opponent of Revolution

Horror of revolution and suspicion of reform after 1815

48. In June, 1815, the Congress of Vienna brought together the results of all the treaties and arrangements which its various members had agreed upon among themselves, and issued its "Final Act," in which its work was summed up for convenient reference. A few days later the battle of Waterloo and the subsequent exile of Napoleon freed the powers from their chief cause of solicitude during the past fifteen years. No wonder that the restored monarchs, as they composed themselves

upon their thrones and reviewed the wars and turmoil which had begun with the French Revolution and lasted more than a quarter of a century, longed for peace at any cost, and viewed with the utmost suspicion any individual or party who ventured to suggest further changes. The word "revolution" had acquired a hideous sound, not only to the rulers and their immediate advisers, but to all the aristocratic class and the clergy, who thought that they had reason enough to abhor the modern tendencies as they had seen them at work.

Dangers threatening the permanence of the settlement at Vienna

There were plenty of grounds for suspecting that the Congress of Vienna had only checked the revolution in France to awaken it in other countries. The Belgians chafed under their forced union with Holland; the inhabitants of the Rhine districts which had been taken from France disliked the traditions of Frederick the Great's kingdom, of which the Congress of Vienna had made them a part; many Germans were disgusted that no firm national union had been established; while the Italians resented the intrusion of Austria in their affairs, and the Poles rebelled against being driven under the yoke of the hated Russia.

The Holy Alliance devised by Alexander I (September, 1815)

It was clear that the powers which had combined to reëstablish order must continue their alliance if they hoped to maintain the arrangements they had made and stifle the fires of revolution which were sure to break out at some unexpected point unless the most constant vigilance were exercised. Alexander I proposed a plan for preserving European tranquillity by the formation of a religious brotherhood of monarchs, which was given the name of "The Holy Alliance." This was accepted by the emperor of Austria and the king of Prussia, and published in September, 1815. In this singular instrument their majesties, "in view of the great events which have taken place in Europe during the past three years, and especially in view of the benefits which it has pleased Divine Providence to shed upon those states whose governments have placed their confidence and sole hope in him, have reached the profound

conviction that it is essential to base the policy of the powers, in their mutual relations with one another, upon the sublime truths which are taught by the eternal religion of God our Savior." They solemnly declare "that the present act has for its only aim to manifest to the whole world their firm purpose to have no other rule in the administration of their states and their relations with other governments than the precepts of this holy religion." They agree accordingly to view one another as brothers and compatriots, as "delegates of Providence to govern three branches of the same family." All the other European powers who should recognize the sacred principles of the act were to be welcomed cordially and affectionately into "this holy alliance."

The Holy Alliance not a union to prevent revolution

The Tsar and Frederick William took the alliance seriously, but to most of the diplomats who had participated in the scramble for the spoils at Vienna, and who looked back upon the habits of monarchs in dealing with one another, it was an amusing vagary of the devout Tsar. Metternich declared it "verbiage" and Castlereagh, "a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense." Alexander's well-meant league amounted, in fact, to nothing. It was not, as has often been supposed, a conspiracy of despotic monarchs to repress all liberal movements. It contained no definite allusions to the dangers of revolution or to the necessity of maintaining the settlement of Vienna. The name "Holy Alliance" came nevertheless to be applied by the more liberal newspapers and reformers to a real and effective organization of the powers opposed to change. In this case the monarchs did not unite in "the name of the Most High" to promote Christian charity, but frankly combined to fight reform under the worldly guidance of Clement Wencelaus Nepomuk Lothaire, Prince of Metternich-Winneburg-Ochsenhausen.

Metternich's political creed

Metternich, who was destined to succeed Napoleon as the most conspicuous statesman in Europe, was born in 1773 and had followed the course of the French Revolution from the

beginning. He had observed its excesses and the devastating wars which had grown out of it, and he saw only evil in the great changes which were taking place. As a member of a noble family he was opposed to liberal ideas and boasted that the reasoning of the French philosophers had left his stanch old beliefs untouched. The views of kingship entertained by James I and Louis XIV seemed to him perfectly sound. Men had no natural right to govern themselves or to decide upon their religious beliefs. All talk about constitutions and national unity was to him revolutionary, and therefore highly dangerous.

Any development of the spirit of nationality dangerous to Austria

He was doubtless much strengthened in his hostility to reform by the situation of Austria, whose affairs he had been guiding since 1809. No country, except Prussia, had suffered more from the Revolution, which it had been the first to oppose in 1792. Should the idea of nationality gain ground, the various peoples included in the Austrian Empire — Germans, Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Italians, and the rest — would surely revolt and each demand its own constitution. Liberal ideas, whether in Austria, Italy, or Germany, foreboded the destruction of the highly artificial Austrian realms, which had been accumulated through the centuries by conquest, marriage, and inheritance without regard to the great differences between the races which were gathered together under the scepter of Francis I. Consequently to Metternich the preservation of Austria, the suppression of reformers and of agitators for constitutional government, and "the tranquillity of Europe," all meant one and the same thing.

Secret alliance of November 20, 1815

Accordingly, shortly after the signing of the Holy Alliance, a secret agreement was entered into by Austria, Prussia, England, and Russia, which frankly declared that the tranquillity of Europe depended upon the maintenance in France of the royal authority which the allies had restored, and furthermore, that it was their purpose to prevent renewed disturbance of the peace of Europe. In order to effect their ends the powers agreed to hold periodical meetings with a view to considering

their common interests and taking such measures as should be expedient for the preservation of general order. Thus a sort of international congress was established for the purpose of upholding the settlement of Vienna.

Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818

The first formal meeting of the powers under this agreement took place at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 to arrange for the evacuation of France by the troops of the allies, which had been stationed there since 1814 to suppress any possible disorder. France, once more admitted to the brotherhood of nations, joined Metternich's conservative league, and that judicious statesman could report with complacency that the whole conference was a brilliant triumph for those principles which he held dearest. He was indeed the soul of the alliance and later used it, as we shall see, to crush dangerous reform movements in Italy and Spain; but he did not enjoy the permanent support of England, or even of France, and in spite of his efforts the world continued to move.

Main changes in the map of Europe since the Congress of Vienna

A glance at the map of Europe to-day will make plain that the Congress of Vienna failed to fix forever the metes and bounds, and the system of government, of the European states. Metternich's flimsy union of German states has given way to the German Empire. Prussia, Austria's old rival, has evidently grown at the expense of its neighbors, as several of the lesser German states of 1815 — Hanover, Nassau, and Hesse-Cassel — no longer appear on the map, and Schleswig-Holstein, which then belonged to Denmark, is now Prussian. It will be noted that the present German Empire does not include any part of the Austrian countries, as did the Confederation of 1815, and that, on the other hand, Prussia is its dominant member. The kingdom of Poland has become an integral part of the Russian dominions. Austria, excluded from the German union, has entered into a dual union with Hungary, in which the two countries are placed upon a footing of equality.

There was no kingdom of Italy in 1815. Now Austria has lost all hold on Lombardy and Venetia, and all the little Italian

states reëstablished by the Congress of Vienna, including the Papal States, have disappeared. A new kingdom, Belgium, has been created out of the old Austrian Netherlands which the Congress gave to the king of Holland. France, now a republic again, has recovered Savoy but has lost all her possessions on the Rhine by the cession of Alsace and Lorraine to the German Empire. Lastly, Turkey in Europe has nearly disappeared, and several new states, Greece, Servia, Roumania, and Bulgaria, have appeared in southeastern Europe. It is the purpose of the following volume to show how the great changes indicated on the map took place and explain the accompanying internal changes, in so far as they represent the general trend of modern development, or have an importance for Europe at large.

REFERENCES

The Character of the Congress of Vienna: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xix, pp. 576–588; FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 380–382; SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe since 1814*, pp. 2–3; ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe*, Vol. I, pp. 90–93.

The Polish-Saxon Controversy: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xix, pp. 593–599; ANDREWS, Vol. I, pp. 93–97; FYFFE, pp. 381–387.

The Territorial Settlement in Italy: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xix, pp. 601–604.

The Final Act of the Vienna Congress: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xxi, pp. 646–663.

Union among the Powers to maintain the Vienna Settlement: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. IX, chap. xxi, pp. 663–671; FYFFE, pp. 408–411.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN EUROPE

An Introduction to the Study of Current History

By JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON, Professor of History in Columbia University, and Charles A. Beard, Adjunct Professor of Politics in Columbia University

VOLUME I. The Eighteenth Century: The French Revolution and the Napoleonic Period. 12mo. Cloth. 362 pages. With illustrations and maps. List price, $1.50; mailing price, $1.60

VOLUME II. Europe since the Congress of Vienna. 12mo. Cloth. 448 pages. With illustrations and maps. List price, $1.60; mailing price, $1.75

THESE volumes will meet the demand for a history of recent times which shall explain the social and economic as well as the political development of our own age, and shall also prepare the student to understand the great problems of the world in which he finds himself.

Their aim is to correct the general disregard of recent history, — to enable the student to catch up with his own times so that he may peruse with intelligence the news given in the morning paper.

Much less space is devoted to purely political and military events than has been commonly assigned to them in histories of the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the more fundamental economic matters — the Industrial Revolution, commerce and the colonies, the internal reforms of the European states, etc. — have been generously treated.

The necessarily succinct outline of events which fills the books can be considerably amplified and enlivened by "Readings in Modern European History" from the same authors, which follows the narrative chapter by chapter, and furnishes examples of the stuff of which history is made.

GINN & COMPANY PUBLISHERS

READINGS IN MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

A collection of extracts from sources chosen with the purpose of illustrating some of the chief phases of the development of Europe during the last two hundred years

By JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON, Professor of History, and CHARLES A. BEARD, Adjunct Professor of Politics, in Columbia University

Volume I. The Eighteenth Century: The French Revolution and the Napoleonic Period. 12mo. Cloth. Illustrated. 410 pages. List price, $1.40; mailing price, $1.50

Volume II. Europe since the Congress of Vienna. 12mo. Cloth. Illustrated. 541 pages. List price, $1.50; mailing price, $1.65

"READINGS IN MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY" aims to stimulate the student to real thought and interest in his work by bringing him right to the sources of historical knowledge and enabling him to see the very words of those who, writing when the past was present, can carry him back to themselves and make their times his own. In this way the book offers the proper background and atmosphere for "The Development of Modern Europe," by the same authors, which it accompanies chapter by chapter and section by section.

Bibliographies provided in the Appendix start the student on the path to a really thorough study of the field.

A goodly number of the readings in this volume are of the constitutional kind which merit and richly reward careful study. A still larger number are of the interesting and lively kind which charm and entertain, and which are valuable because they give the flavor of the olden times. The bibliography is no mere list of unappreciated titles, but an excellent critical classification which guides the student quickly on to the fundamental works. — SIDNEY B. FAY, *Assistant Professor of History, Dartmouth College*, in *The American Historical Review*.

GINN AND COMPANY PUBLISHERS

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF WESTERN EUROPE

By JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON
Professor of History in Columbia University

IN ONE VOLUME

12mo. Cloth. 714 pages. With maps and illustrations. List price, $1.60; mailing price, $1.80.

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME I. 12mo. Cloth. 368 pages. With maps and illustrations. List price, $1.00; mailing price, $1.10.

VOLUME II. 12mo. Cloth. 364 pages. With maps and illustrations. List price, $1.00; mailing price, $1.10.

THE excellence of Robinson's "History of Western Europe" has been attested by the immediate and widespread adoption of the book in many of the best schools and colleges of the country. It is an epoch-making text-book on the subject, in that it solves in an entirely satisfactory manner the problem of proportion.

The book differs from its predecessors in omitting all isolated, uncorrelated facts, which only obscure the great issues upon which the pupil's attention should be fixed. In this way the writer has gained the space necessary to give a clear and interesting account of the all-important movements, customs, institutions, and achievements of western Europe since the German barbarians conquered the Roman Empire. Such matters of first-rate importance as feudalism, the mediæval Church, the French Revolution, and the development of the modern European states have received much fuller treatment than has been customary in histories of this compass.

The work is thoroughly scholarly and trustworthy, since the writer has relied either upon the most recent treatises of the best European authorities of the day or upon a personal study of the primary sources themselves. Carefully selected illustrations and an abundance of maps accompany the text.

GINN & COMPANY PUBLISHERS

READINGS IN EUROPEAN HISTORY

By JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON, Professor of History in Columbia University. Designed to supplement his "Introduction to the History of Western Europe"

VOLUME I. 12mo. Cloth. 551 pages. List price, $1.50; mailing price, $1.65

VOLUME II. 12mo. Cloth. 629 pages. List price, $1.50; mailing price, $1.65

ABRIDGED EDITION. 12mo. Cloth. 573 pages. List price, $1.50; mailing price, $1.65

IT is now generally recognized among teachers of history that the text-book should be supplemented by collateral reading. Professor Robinson's "Readings" will supply a need that has long been felt by those dealing with the general history of Europe. For each chapter of his text he furnishes from twenty to thirty pages of extracts, mainly from vivid, first-hand accounts of the persons, events, and institutions discussed in his manual. In this way the statements in the text-book may be amplified and given added interest and vividness. He has drawn upon the greatest variety of material, much of which has never before found its way into English.

The extensive and carefully classified bibliographies which accompany each chapter embody the results of careful criticism and selection. They are carefully arranged to meet the needs of students of all grades, from the high-school pupil to one engaged in advanced graduate work.

Volume I corresponds to Chapters I–XXII of the author's "History of Western Europe," and closes with an account of the Italian cities during the Renaissance. Volume II begins with Europe at the opening of the sixteenth century. The Abridged Edition is intended especially for high schools.

GINN & COMPANY PUBLISHERS

00037641

WW-h-21 vol C
940.2 Rob/Dev 37621
Development of modern Europe
37641

Name of borrower	Lent on.	Received on.
[illegible]	24-9 H10	
[illegible]	3/12/18	11/12/18
	21-1-68	
		20/2/68
		8

Digitized with financial assistance from

HT Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 15 October, 2018